

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



125 024

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



















## EXPLANATORY NOTE

In this volume have been brought together materials that will be of use to the student or individual wishing to know how to prepare a debate or how to organize a debating society or league of debating organizations. While conforming to The Handbook Series in that it is made up of reprints of articles taken from a large number of sources, effort has been made to select those articles that describe the subject most clearly and concisely and, at the same time, give a fairly well-connected account of the various processes.

For convenience the work has been divided into two parts. In Part I have been put all the articles relating to the preparation of the individual debate. The articles have been selected so as to describe, in logical order, all the steps through which the debater must go: Selecting the question and defining the terms; analyzing to determine the main issues; collecting and recording evidence; selection and proper use of evidence—this includes a description of the forms of reasoning and fallacies; drafting the brief; preparing the argument from the brief; and practical suggestions for delivery and for the division of the work among the members of the debating team.

Part II is devoted to the organization and management of the debating society. In the articles included in this division are conveyed brief and valuable suggestions for organizing a society and drawing up its constitution; the management of the society, including a brief description of the more important rules of order; selecting of the teams; the coaching and judging of a debate. The latter half of Part II is given over to a description of various forms of inter-society debating organizations, with model constitutions.

For the benefit of those wishing to read more extensively on the subject, a list of books on debate and public speaking is appended to the book. There is also included, as Appendix B, a subject index to a large number of books and pamphlets containing bibliographies, briefs, arguments pro and con, reprints of selected articles, or reports of entire debates on questions of

importance. Most of these books and reports are completely indexed, others for important subjects only. The object has been to get an up-to-date usable subject list rather than a complete one.

This subject index ought to be especially helpful to high school debaters in selecting topics for debate, and after having selected them, to obtain helpful material for the debate itself.

The compiler wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to the authors from whose works material has been drawn for this volume, and to thank the publishers for their kind permission to reprint the selections.

E. M. PHELPS

July 15, 1915

## EXPLANATORY NOTE FOR THE SIXTH EDITION

This Sixth edition of the Manual is presented in the hope that it may meet with the same generous response that has been accorded to previous editions. The volume has been brought down to date by the revision of the present contents where it seemed advisable, and also by the addition of new material, especially on the subjects of Persuasion, Judging and New systems of debating.

The appendices have been revised thoroly and much new material has been added. In Appendix B, references to material now out of print have been retained in most cases, and marked "out of print," as much of it is still valuable and available in many libraries.

Grateful acknowledgement is made to all those who gave so freely of material and information for this new edition, especially to Mr. H. B. Gislason of the Extension Division, University of Minnesota, for re-writing his articles on Evidence and Refutation, and to Mrs. Ruth Tichenor for her assistance in revising the bibliography.

E. M. PHELPS

August 8, 1929

# CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

Definition and Importance of Argumentation and Debate. (Ketcham, V. A. Theory and Practice of Argumentation and Debate. Chap. I. Copyright by The Macmillan Co. 1914.) .....	1
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

## PART I. HOW TO PREPARE A DEBATE

1. Selecting the Proposition for Debate. (School Review. 35:538-46. September, 1927. Selection of the Proposition for Debate. Walter H. Adams.) .....	7
2. Analyzing the Proposition. (Ketcham, V. A. Theory and Practice of Argumentation and Debate. Chap. III. Copyright by The Macmillan Co. 1914.) .....	9
3. Evidence.	
a. Collecting and Recording Material for Evidence.	22
b. How to Estimate and Present the Evidence. (Gislason, H. B. Effective Debating. p. 17-27. Univ. of Minn. 1914.) .....	28
i. Testimonial Evidence .....	29
ii. Circumstantial Evidence .....	33
Argument from Generalization .....	33
Argument from Analogy .....	36
Argument Based on Causal Relationship.	38



c. Refutation.	
(Gislason, H. B. <i>Effective Debating</i> . p. 27-35. Univ. of Minn. 1914.) .....	40
I. Classification of Fallacies .....	41
II. What and When to Refute .....	47
4. Constructing the Brief.	
(Lyon, L. S. <i>Elements of Debating</i> . Lesson VI. Univ. of Chicago Press. 1913.) .....	51
5. Developing the Argument from the Brief.	
(Lyon, L. S. <i>Elements of Debating</i> . Lesson VII. Univ. of Chicago Press. 1913.) .....	56
6. Presenting the Argument.	
a. Influencing the Audience by Persuasion.....	61
b. The Natural Procedure in Argument.	
(Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11: 319-37. November 1925. <i>Natural Procedure</i> in Argument. Gladys Graham.) .....	62
c. Delivery of the Debate.	
(Jones, L. <i>Manual for Debaters</i> . p. 66-9. Univ. of Wash. 1913.) .....	67
d. Facing the Audience.	
(Esenwein, J. B. <i>How to Attract and Hold</i> an Audience. p. 154-9. Hinds, Noble & Eldredge. 1902.) .....	70
7. Cooperation among Debaters.	
a. Conferences among Debaters.	
(Gislason, H. B. <i>Effective Debating</i> . p. 36. Univ. of Minn. 1914.) .....	73
b. Division of Work among Speakers.	
(Genung and Hanson. <i>Outlines of Compo-</i> sition and Rhetoric. p. 351-2. Ginn & Co. 1915.) .....	74

# CONTENTS

ix

1. Work of the First Affirmative and Negative Speakers. (Lyon, L. S. Elements of Debating. p. 55-6. Univ. of Chicago Press. 1913.).....	75
8. Rebuttal.	
a. Speeches in Rebuttal. (Denney, Duncan and McKinney. Argumentation and Debate. p. 115. Am. Book Co. 1910.).....	76
b. Suggestions for the Rebuttal Speaker in Debate. (Clarence S. Dike.) .....	76

## PART II. DEBATING SOCIETIES: ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

1. Directions for Organizing. (Drury, Newton B. How to Organize and Conduct a Debating Society. In California University: Debating and Debating Societies. p. 11-13.)....	83
a. Model Constitution and By-Laws. (North Carolina University Record. Extension Series. No. 6. p. 47-54 January, 1914. Constitution and By-Laws for High School Literary Societies.) .....	86
2. Management and Procedure.	
a. Essential Rules of Parliamentary Practice.....	94
b. Debating Tryouts. (Jones, L. Manual for Debaters. p. 26-8. Univ. of Wash. 1913.) .....	100
1. Suggestions from the Experience of a Teacher of Argumentation and Debate. (English Journal. 2:389-90. June, 1913. Work in Debates. A. G. Grandy.)....	101

ii. Tryouts in High School Debating. (Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:136-8. April, 1924. Debate Coach- ing in High Schools—Benefits and Methods. Ruth E. Huston.).....	103
c. Coaching.	
(Jones, L. Manual for Debaters. p. 31-3. Univ. of Wash. 1913.).....	105
i. Coaching in High Schools. (Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:138-42. April, 1924. Debate Coach- ing in High Schools—Benefits and Methods. Ruth E. Huston.).....	107
ii. Evils of Over-coaching. (English Journal. 3:94-8. February, 1914. Appreciation and Management of High School Debate. A. T. Otis.).....	112
d. Judging the Debate.	
(Jones, L. Manual for Debaters. p. 31. Univ. of Wash. 1913.) .....	113
i. Instructions to Judges. (Montana. University Extension Depart- ment. Montana High School Debating League. p. 13-16. August, 1914.).....	114
ii. The Expert Judge. (Nebraska University Eighteenth Annual Bulletin. 1927. p. 15-16. Decisions in Debates. H. Adelbert White.).....	116
iii. Audience Decisions in Debating. (Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:315-16. June, 1924.) .....	118
iv. No-Decision Debates. (Gavel. 11:14. January, 1929. No-Decision Debates. Ewald T. Grether.).....	119

e. New Systems of Debating.	
I. Oxford System of Debating. (Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:215-22. June, 1923. Shall American Universities Adopt the British System of Debating. A. C. Baird.).....	121
II. Open Forum Debating. (Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:340-5. November, 1924. Two Years of Open Forum Debating at Swarth- more. Philip M. Hicks.) .....	128
III. Oregon Plan. (Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking. 12: 175-80. April, 1926. J. Stanley Grey.)..	130
IV. Intra-Squad Debates. (Woodward, H. S. Forum Debating at Western Reserve. <i>In</i> Nebraska Uni- versity. Seventeenth Annual Bulletin. 1926. p. 15-16.) .....	131
V. The Three-Sided Debate. (Gavel. 11:10-11. May, 1929. Two Experi- ments in Debating. Raymond F. Howes.) .....	132
VI. A Debating Union. (School and Society. 27:770-4. June 30, 1928. On College Debating. Robert Withington.) .....	133
3. Interscholastic Debating Leagues.	
a. Forms of Organization. (Education. 34:416-20. March, 1914. Group Systems in Interscholastic Debating. D. E. Watkins.) .....	134
b. The University of Texas Interscholastic League Contests in Debate. (Roy Bedichek.) .....	138

c.	Constitution and By-Laws of the Oregon High School Debating League. (Oregon University Bulletin. Vol. XII. No. 3. p. 16-22. November, 1914.) .....	140
d.	Model Contract for a Triangular League. (Jones, L. Manual for Debaters. p. 22-6. Univ. of Wash. 1913.).....	148
e.	Contract for a Pentangular League.....	153

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.	Selected Bibliography on Public Speaking, Argumentation and Debate. ....	159
APPENDIX B.	Subject Index to Books and Pamphlets Con- taining Complete Debates, References, Briefs and Similar Material for Debates...	173

# DEBATORS' MANUAL

---

## INTRODUCTION

### DEFINITION AND IMPORTANCE OF ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE<sup>1</sup>

I. DEFINITIONS.—Argumentation is the art of persuading others to think or act in a definite way. It includes all writing and speaking which is persuasive in form. The salesman persuading a prospective customer to buy goods, the student inducing his fellow-student to contribute to the funds of the athletic association, the business or professional man seeking to enlarge his business and usefulness, and the great orator or writer whose aim is to control the destiny of nations, all make use of the art of argumentation to attain their various objects. These illustrations serve but to indicate the wide field of thought and action which this subject includes. Each instance in this broad field, which demands the use of the art of argumentation, is subject to the same general laws that govern the construction and presentation of formal arguments. Formal arguments may be either written or oral, but by far the greater benefit to the student of argumentation results from the delivery of oral arguments, for it is in this form that he will be most frequently called upon to use his skill.

Debating is the oral presentation of arguments under such conditions that each speaker may reply directly to the arguments of the opposing speaker. The debate is opened by the first speaker for the affirmative. He is then followed by the first speaker for the negative, each side speaking alternately until each man has presented his main speech. After all the main speeches have been delivered the negative opens the rebuttal. The speakers in rebuttal alternate negative and affirmative. This order gives the closing speech to the affirmative. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Ketcham, V. A. *Theory and Practice of Argumentation and Debate*. Chap. I. Copyright by The Macmillan Co. 1914.

A proposition in argumentation is the formal statement of a subject for debate. It begins with the word "Resolved,"—followed by the statement of the subject matter of the controversy, and worded in accordance with the rules laid down in the next chapter. In formal debate it is always expressed; as for example, "Resolved, That the Federal Government should levy a progressive income tax." In other forms of argumentation it may be only implied, as in the case of the salesman selling goods, the student soliciting subscriptions, the business man in arguing for consolidation, or the politician pleading for reform. Nevertheless, it is always advisable for the speaker or writer to have clearly in mind a definite proposition as a basis upon which to build his argument. The proposition for the salesman might be, "Resolved, that James Fox ought to buy a piano"; for the student solicitor, "Resolved, that George Clark ought to give ten dollars to the athletic fund"; for the business man, "Resolved, that all firms engaged in the manufacture of matches should consolidate"; and for the politician, "Resolved, that the tariff schedule on necessities should be lowered." This framing of a definite, clear-cut proposition will prevent wandering from the subject and give to the argument the qualities of clearness, unity, and relevancy.

Referring to the definition with which this chapter opened the student should note that it defines argumentation as an art. While it is true that argumentation must be directed in accordance with scientific principles, and while it is also true that it has an intimate relation with the science of logic, yet it is primarily an art in which skill, tact, diplomacy, and the finer sensibilities must be utilized to their fullest extent. In this respect argumentation is an art as truly as music, sculpture, poetry, or painting. The successful debater must be master of this art if he hopes to convince and persuade real men to his way of thinking and thus to direct their action.

II. THE OBJECT OF ARGUMENTATION.—The object of argumentation is not only to induce others to accept our opinions and beliefs in regard to any disputed matter, but to induce them to act in accordance with our opinions and beliefs. The end of argumentation is action. The form which this action is to take depends upon the nature of the disputed matter. It may be only an action of the mind resulting in a definite belief which will exert an influence in the world for good or evil. It may be

the desire of the one who argues to persuade his hearers to advocate his opinions and beliefs and thus spread his doctrines to many other individuals. It may be that some more decided physical action is desired, such as the casting of a vote, or the purchase of a certain article or commodity. It may be the taking up of arms against a state, race, or nation, or the pursuit of a definite line of conduct throughout the remainder of the life of the individual addressed. These and many other phases of action may be the objects of the debater.

III. EDUCATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF ARGUMENTATION.—From the standpoint of mental discipline no study offers more practical training than does argumentation. It cultivates that command of feeling and concentration of thought which keeps the mind healthily active. The value of this kind of mental exercise cannot be overestimated. Especially is it valuable when the arguments are presented in the form of a debate, in which the speaker is assigned to defend a definite position and must reply to attacks made on that position. Such work brings forth the best powers of mind possessed by the student. It cultivates quickness of thought, and the ability to meet men on their own ground and conduct a successful encounter on the battlefield of ideas.

Another faculty of mind which debating develops is tact in the selection and presentation of material. Since the object of debate is action, it is not enough that the speaker show his position to be the correct one. He must do more than this; he must make the hearer desire to act in accordance with that position. Otherwise the speaker will be in the same position as the savage who induces his fellows to conform to his ideas by the use of a club,—the moment the influence of the club is removed the subject immediately reverts to his former habits of thought and action. If you convince a man that he is wrong by the mere force of argument, he may be unable to answer your argument but he will feel like a man who has been whipped in a physical encounter—though technically defeated he still holds to his former opinions. There is much truth in the old saying that, "He who is convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." Therefore, the debater must do more than merely convince his hearer; he must persuade him. He must appeal to the reason, it is true, but he must also appeal to the emotions in such a way as to persuade his hearer to take some definite action in regard to the subject of dispute. Thus there are two things



which the debater must attempt—conviction and persuasion. If he convinces his reader without persuading him, no action is likely to follow. If he persuades his hearer by appealing to his emotions, the effect of his efforts will be short lived. Therefore, the debater must train himself to persuade his hearer to act in accordance with his wishes as well as to find reasons for such action and give them.

Finally, debating cultivates the ability to use clear and forcible language. Practice of this kind gives the student a wealth of expression and command of language which is not otherwise possible. The obligation to reply directly to one's opponents makes it necessary for the student to have such command of his material that he can make it apply directly to the arguments he has just heard.

The educational value of debating is greater than that of any other form of oral or written composition because it cultivates: (1) The command of feeling and concentration of thought which keep the mind healthily active, (2) The ability to state a clear-cut proposition, and to analyze it keenly by sifting the essential from the trivial, thus revealing the real point at issue, (3) The ability to find reasons and give them, (4) The power to state facts and conditions with that tact and diplomacy which success demands, (5) The power to persuade as well as to convince, (6) The power of clear and forcible expression. Certainly any subject which tends to develop these qualities ought to receive the most careful attention of the student.

IV. PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE OF ARGUMENTATION.—From the practical standpoint no study offers better preparation for the everyday affairs of life than does argumentation and debate. Success in life is largely a matter of reducing every situation to a definite, clear-cut proposition, analyzing that proposition or picking out the main points at issue, and then directing one's efforts to the solution of the problem thus revealed. To be more concrete: One young man accepts the first situation which is brought to his notice when he graduates, and stays in a mediocre position for years; another young man thinks carefully over the matter, picks out a place where he is most likely to succeed, and secures rapid promotion. Instances might be multiplied indefinitely to show the practical value of argumentative training. The man who is an expert in the use of argument holds the master key to success in all lines. It is an invaluable asset to

every one who has to deal with practical affairs. It matters not whether you are to address one individual or a thousand—whether you wish to persuade to a certain course of action your employer, a committee, a board of directors, a town council, the Senate of the United States, or an auditorium full of people, knowledge of the use and application of the rules of argumentation, and good training in the art of debate are most valuable assets. The business world, the professional world, and the political world eagerly welcome the man who can think and who can effectively present his thoughts. In every business, in every profession, and in every department of government the skilled debater becomes the leader of men.

■



## PART I

# HOW TO PREPARE A DEBATE

### I. SELECTING THE PROPOSITION FOR DEBATE<sup>1</sup>

One of the most troublesome problems connected with high-school debate is the selection of a suitable proposition for debate.

Two fundamental principles may be set down on which there is absolute agreement. First, no one will deny that the proposition should be such that it will be in keeping with the objectives of high-school debate; that is, the proposition must be such that, by careful study of it, pupils will be trained in their ability to organize material in a logical manner, and it must be one that will lead to an interesting presentation of a logical argument before an audience, delivered for the purpose of convincing the hearers of the truth or falsity of the proposition. Second, all will agree that the proposition should be technically correct.

The second principle is generally understood and needs little discussion. This does not mean that it is any the less important. In fact, it is surprising to note the large number of violations of this principle on the part of those who have to do with stating propositions. Especially is this surprising when it is remembered that any one of a large number of modern textbooks in argumentation and debate presents in detail the technical requirements of a proposition for debate. There is little difference of opinion among authorities as to these requirements.

They may be summarized in the following rules.

1. The proposition should be stated in the form of an assertion.
2. It should be debatable.
3. It should not employ ambiguous terms.
4. It should not be too broad.

<sup>1</sup> School Review, 35:538-46. September, 1927. Selection of the Proposition for Debate. Walter H. Adams.

5. It should not be double-headed.
6. It should give to the affirmative the burden of proof.
7. It should not be question-begging.

It can be said without fear of controversy that a proposition for debate that is not so framed as to be in keeping with these rules should be discarded. It will be seen that many of the questions that are being debated at present would not be used were they judged in the light of these rules. In one state the following question is being debated: "Resolved, That Congress should promptly enact agricultural legislation that would insure to the producers of staple agricultural products a price exceeding the world price by the amount of the tariff thereon for that portion used in the United States, and providing for losses on the exportable surplus by means of an equalization fee against each product." This question is at fault not only because it is ambiguous and perhaps too difficult for high-school pupils but also because it is double-headed.

To illustrate further, the writer was once called upon to debate the proposition, "Resolved, That the production and distribution of coal and oil in the United States should be controlled and regulated by the federal government." There are at least six different debates tied up in this one proposition . . .

Of equal importance with the foregoing but of greater complexity is the principle that the proposition should be in keeping with the objectives of debate.

Practically all that has been written on this phase of the problem, in addition to what might be included in the technical requirements noted, may be summarized by saying that the proposition should be of interest to the speakers and to the audience before whom the debate is held.

The term "popular interest" as used in connection with debate must not be misunderstood. In their effort to arouse the interest of the pupils and of the community, some coaches choose questions for debate that are undesirable. To be of compelling interest, a proposition must be vitally significant to the debaters and to the audience. It must be one on which they desire information and which they believe will help them in solving a problem with which they are confronted.

The following question has recently been debated ("discussed" is a better term to use) in a number of universities: "Resolved,

That we have more to fear than to hope for from science." While this question might be appropriate, as someone has suggested, for a discussion at a dinner table, it is technically incorrect and therefore not suitable as a question for debate. From the standpoint of interest, it would not be suitable for a high-school debate because the question has not arisen from the "tossings and the uncertainties" of the actual life of the pupils and the general public. It would not be "real" to the pupils nor to the audience before whom they would be called upon to debate.

In one state at the present time there is considerable agitation for the adoption of the county-unit method of school administration. This is a question in which the people of a community are vitally interested because nothing concerns them more than do the schools. It is a question that is of real interest to the pupils because their welfare is involved. Such a question as the following therefore meets every requirement for a proposition for high-school debate: "Resolved, That the county-unit method of school administration should be adopted in the state of \_\_\_\_\_." It is technically correct and is of interest to both the pupils and the general public.

It is only through an appreciation of this secondary function of debating—to disseminate information on questions of the day—that the element of interest will always be present. While the primary function of debate is to train pupils to analyze a proposition and to present a logical argument before an audience for the purpose of winning the hearers to the debaters' way of thinking, this secondary function will serve as an excellent means of motivating debate and will aid in a realization of the primary function.

## 2. ANALYZING THE PROPOSITION<sup>1</sup>

### THE IMPORTANCE OF ANALYSIS

The subject for argument has been determined and it has been reduced to a satisfactory proposition. The next step is to analyze this proposition. It is well to consider first the importance of this analysis in order that its true value may be appreciated, and this preliminary step be not passed over hurriedly.

<sup>1</sup> Ketcham, V. A. *Theory and Practice of Argumentation and Debate*. Chap. III. Copyright by The Macmillan Co. 1914.

Upon the success of the analysis depends in large measure the success of the argument. This is true because the analysis shows just what must be proved in order to sustain or overthrow the proposition. If the work has been done carefully the student will have confidence in the solidity of his argument. He cannot feel secure if he suspects that his analysis is defective.

The question of analysis is not only of supreme importance in relation to a particular proposition for discussion, but it is also of the greatest importance in all the practical affairs of life. No mental quality is so necessary as the analytical habit of mind. Practically all the men whom history calls great have possessed in a large degree the habit of analyzing everything. Lincoln was in the habit of applying this analytic process not only to great affairs of state but to anything and everything which came beneath his notice. He analyzed the actions of his fellow men, the workings of a machine, the nature of moral principles, and the significance of political movements. He was continually penetrating to the point of things, visible and invisible, and laying it bare.

Everything which comes up for personal action should be analyzed and the vital point at issue determined. Nothing should be done blindly or in a spirit of trusting to luck or chance. Instead of voting as the majority seem to be voting in a class meeting, analyze the issue and vote according to the light revealed by that analysis. Instead of entering some business or profession blindly and in the hope that something will turn up, analyze the situation and determine rationally what ought to be done. For the right determination of these practical affairs no better preparation can be made than the careful analysis of propositions for debate.

#### ESSENTIAL STEPS IN ANALYSIS

1. A BROAD VIEW OF THE SUBJECT.—In the first place the student must know something about the subject-matter of the proposition. If the question is of a local character and one with which he is familiar, the work of analysis may be begun at once. The proposition can be scrutinized, its exact meaning determined, and the proof for its establishment or overthrow decided upon. If the question be one with which the student is not familiar his first duty is to become acquainted in a general way with the subject-matter. He should carefully examine the

proposition to see just what subject-matter is included and then consult someone familiar with its substance, or read some material which appears to treat the subject in a general way. Here confusion is likely to result if an attempt is made to substitute reading for thinking. The mind of the investigator should be kept open, free, and independent. He should not allow the opinions of men, either oral or written, to cause him to depart from the precise wording of the proposition. His present object is to determine its limits, meaning and significance.

When a general knowledge of the subject has been acquired, sufficient to enable the student to reason about the question, he should next consider the origin and history of the question.

2. THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE QUESTION.—The meaning of a question must be determined in the light of the conditions which gave rise to its discussion. For this reason it is well to find out just how this question came to be a subject of debate. For example, the people of this country a few years ago were debating the proposition, "Resolved, that the Federal government should control all life insurance companies operating within the United States." To one unacquainted with the facts of the case at that time the proposition appears at first glance to lack point. Why should anyone want Federal control of insurance companies? What difference does it make who controls them or whether they are controlled at all? These questions are answered directly when we come to study the origin of the proposition. Until within a few months of the discussions no one had thought of debating this proposition. The insurance companies had always been under the control of the states in which they operated. Then suddenly it came to light that these companies were grossly mismanaged. Dishonesty had characterized the administration of their affairs. This served to cast grave doubt on the efficiency of state control. Therefore the stronger arm of the Federal government was suggested as a remedy for the evils which the states had been unable to prevent. The real heart of the controversy, which a study of the origin of the question revealed was, "Will the control of insurance companies by the Federal government be more efficient than that exercised by the state governments?" Thus the real point at issue was made clear through the origin of the question.

In the search for the main issues, the history of the question is often important. However, the tendency of the inexperienced



debater is to dwell too long upon this part of the argument. Actual practice often reveals the fact that such a history causes the audience or reader to lose interest. This is especially true if its bearing on the argument is not immediately shown.

The history of the question should, however, receive serious consideration, and any facts which bear directly upon its solution should be stated in brief and concise form. When the question has undergone a change because of shifting conditions, its history becomes especially important. Very often the original significance of a controversy becomes entirely changed by subsequent happenings. In such a case the history of the question should be resorted to for the purpose of finding out the changes through which the original dispute has passed and determining the exact issues involved at the present time.

3. DEFINITION OF TERMS.—Before proceeding farther it is well to examine each word in the proposition. Now that a general idea of the significance of the proposition has been obtained, and the main point of the controversy reached through the study of the origin and history of the question, the task of defining terms may be undertaken in an intelligent manner.

Let it be understood at the outset that a dictionary definition is not satisfactory. A dictionary gives every meaning which can be attached to a given word and thus covers a broad, general field. But when a word is used in a proposition for debate it is used in a special and restricted sense. The meaning depends largely on the context of the proposition. The origin and history of the question, the meaning which expert writers on this particular subject have attached to the words, and the present conditions must be considered in determining the precise meaning of the terms.

The words of a proposition which need definition are very often so grouped that the meaning of a phrase or combination of words taken as a whole must be determined. Here it is plain that dictionary definitions, even if satisfactory in other respects, would be entirely inadequate. In the [following] question, "Resolved, that monopolies in restraint of trade should be regulated by Federal law," we find a necessity for the definition of both a term and a phrase. The term "regulate" may not in this instance be given the broad meaning which a dictionary definition attaches to it. We must first look at the context of the proposition in order to find out to what field of authority we should go for a proper definition.

The proposition specified regulation by Federal law: therefore we must go to the law for our definition of the term which indicates the action the law is to take. But even here we need not be satisfied with the broad legal definition of the term "regulate." The field included by the question is obviously a commercial field. The agencies which would come under this regulation are for the most part engaged in interstate commerce. Therefore the power to regulate would be placed under that clause of the United States Constitution which expressly gives Congress the power to regulate commerce. We may then rely upon the definition which the courts have placed upon the term "regulate" when used in this connection. By consulting Black's "Constitutional Law," an eminent authority on this subject, we find that the power to "regulate" has never been held to include the power to destroy. This eliminates a possible meaning. By consulting some of the decisions of the United States courts in which this term has been defined, we are given to understand that to "regulate" commerce implies that "an intention to promote and facilitate it, and not to hamper or destroy it, is naturally to be attributed to Congress." (*Texas & P. R. Co. v Interstate Commerce Commission*, 162 U. S., 197; *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Alabama Midland Ry. Co.*, 74 Fed., 715). Therefore we are warranted in concluding that to "regulate" in this proposition means such control by the Federal law as will promote the best commercial interests of the country at large.

It is thus seen that both the definition of the term and the source from which it is taken are determined by the context of the proposition. If the context of the proposition shows that legal definitions are required, legal authorities must be consulted. If the context of the proposition shows that an economic definition is required, economic authorities should be consulted. In whatever field of knowledge the context of the proposition lies, the authoritative definitions generally accepted in these branches of learning should be consulted.

In defining the phrase "monopolies in restraint of trade" the student should consult the same class of authorities utilized in defining the term "regulate." The generally accepted definitions used by prominent writers may be relied upon with safety, since they are usually taken directly from authoritative reports and decisions.

One of the most important requisites of a definition is that it be reasonable. It must appear, in the light of all the circumstances



(b) *Admitting Matters not Vital to the Argument.*—Since the debater should not attempt to prove more than is necessary he should admit, in the beginning, such matters as may be admitted without detriment. Great care should be exercised at this point; nothing should be admitted the full bearing and significance of which the debater does not understand. Only matters which may be admitted with safety should be included. Otherwise an opponent may seize upon the admitted matter and turn it to his own advantage. Furthermore, the language used in making an admission should be carefully guarded lest an opponent ingeniously attach to it a meaning which was not intended.

With these cautions in mind it is well to continue the process of narrowing the question by admitting matters not vital to the argument. These admissions should be made in the beginning in order that they may appear in their true light as free admissions. For example, in the last question discussed both sides may safely admit that neither plan will wholly eliminate intemperance. The object is to adopt the plan which will minimize the effect of this evil. In the question, "Resolved, that physical valuation of the property of a corporation is the best basis for fixing taxation values," the affirmative may safely admit that no basis for fixing taxation values will work absolute justice to all tax-payers. This places the affirmative speakers in position to make plain to their hearers that the method advocated will come nearer to the goal of absolute justice than any other plan. In advocating any reform it is usually best to admit that it is not a cure-all for existent evils, but that it will remedy such evils to a greater extent than any other measures.

In conclusion, it is well to remember that these admissions and exclusions should be made plain rather than elaborate. They should be stated in the introduction of the argument with such brevity and clearness that the audience will realize that it is being led directly to the vital issues.

5. *CONTRASTING THE AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENTS WITH THOSE OF THE NEGATIVE.*—Thus far we have been concerned with finding out the vital point at issue. It is here that the term question is most aptly applied to the proposition for debate, because when this vital point is revealed it is always found to appear in the form of a question. To be more specific, we found that in analyzing the proposition, "Resolved, That the Federal Government should control all life insurance companies operating

within the United States," the vital point at issue as revealed by a study of the origin of the question was "Will the control of insurance companies by the Federal Government be more efficient than that exercised by the State Governments?" This treatment reveals the main point at issue in the form of a question. It shows that the issue is between State control on one side as compared with Federal control on the other. The affirmative must advocate Federal control and the negative must defend State control. The burden of proof is on the affirmative, for it must show that a change should be made in existing conditions. The risk of non-persuasion is upon the affirmative, because, if the position advocated cannot be maintained, existing conditions will continue.

It is well to remember that the burden of proof remains with the affirmative throughout the debate. It is frequently said that the burden of proof "shifts," that is, that when the affirmative has produced enough evidence to make out a *prima facie* case, and has shown reason why the plan ought to be adopted, then the burden of proof shifts to the negative and it becomes the duty of the negative to show why the plan should not be adopted. This is not the correct view of the situation, for the affirmative is bound to prove the proposition, in the face of all opposition. Therefore the burden of proof never "shifts," it is the duty of producing evidence which "shifts." When the affirmative shows reason why the proposition should be maintained, it puts upon the negative the duty of producing evidence to show that the affirmative reasoning is unsound or that there are more weighty arguments in favor of the negative. Thus it is that the duty of producing evidence shifts from one side to the other, but the burden of proof remains on the same party throughout the discussion.

The question upon which the debate hinges must be answered in one way by one side and in just the opposite way by the opponents of that side. In the question above referred to, "Will the control of insurance companies by the Federal Government be more efficient than that exercised by the State Governments?" the affirmative must answer "Yes" and the negative must answer "No."

At this point the next task of the analyst begins. He must determine the main reasons why the affirmative should answer "Yes" and the negative should answer "No." These main reasons when discovered and contrasted, those on the affirmative with

those on the negative, will reveal the main issues of the proposition. When these are found the process of analysis is completed.

In undertaking the task of contrasting the affirmative contentions with those of the negative, the student must assume an absolutely unbiased attitude toward the proposition. The importance of this impartial viewpoint cannot be too strongly emphasized. To be able to view any subject with a mind free from prejudice is a most valuable asset.

With this proper mental attitude toward the proposition the analyst must take up both sides of the question and find the main arguments in support of each. He should not be deluded into thinking that it is only necessary to study one side of the question. A lawyer in preparing his case always takes into consideration the position of his opponent. In fact, so important is this task that many lawyers develop their antagonist's case before beginning work on their own, and it frequently happens that more time is devoted to arguments of the opposition than to the case upon which the lawyer is engaged. This careful study of an opponent's arguments must always be included in the work of the debater, not only in the analysis of the question but throughout the entire argumentative process.

The way in which this part of the analytical process should be carried out is best made plain by a concrete example. We will take the proposition "Resolved, That immigration into the United States should be further restricted by law." The origin of the question is found in the alarm shown by some people over the large number of undesirable foreigners coming to our shores. The question is "Should any of the immigrants now coming to our shores be prohibited from coming?" The affirmative say "Yes," and the negative, "No." Now to take the impartial viewpoint, why should there be any further restriction of immigration; why should the affirmative say "Yes" and the negative "No"? One of the chief affirmative arguments is that some of these immigrants are having a bad effect upon our country. Some of them are anarchists; some are members of criminal societies such as the Black Hand; some group by themselves in certain portions of large cities and form what are known as "Little Germanys," "Little Spains," "Little Italys," etc.; some have contagious diseases; some have a very low standard of living and thus tend to drag down the standard of living of the American workman; some are illiterate and do not make good citizens; some are

easily made the dupes of city bosses and ward "heelers" and thus exert a harmful influence in our political affairs. These and various other reasons may be brought to support the affirmative argument that immigration is having a bad effect upon our country.

In considering the matter carefully we come to the conclusion that these are the chief reasons why immigration should be further restricted. Now, the unskilled debater would probably be content with framing these reasons into an argument and would proceed with a feeling that his position was impregnable. The skilled debater, however, does not feel content until he has viewed the whole subject impartially. Why do we not have more stringent immigration laws? It must be that the present laws are thought to be satisfactory. Why are they satisfactory? It must be because they now exclude the worst class of immigrants. Upon investigation we find this to be true. Let us look at the problem from a slightly different point of view. Why do we allow all of these immigrants to come in? They must be necessary to our welfare. They are necessary to develop the natural resources of our country; they add to the national power of production; they possess a money value as laborers; they ultimately become American citizens, and their children, educated in our public schools, become the most ardent of young Americans.

The above reflections from the standpoint of the negative lead us to ask a few questions which must be answered before we can answer the main question upon which the proposition hinges, namely: "Should any of the immigrants now coming into the United States be prohibited from coming?" These questions are, so far as we have been able to determine: "Are the present immigration laws satisfactory?" "Do we need all the immigrants now coming to us?" "Do the immigrants now coming to us have a good effect upon our country?" These questions if answered "No" will establish the affirmative, and likewise if answered "Yes" will establish the negative. We may therefore conclude that these three questions contain the main issues of the proposition. The issues may be stated in different forms, but, if resolved to their essential elements, they will ultimately be found in these three questions.

The next step in contrasting the arguments is to write them down in such form that corresponding arguments can be set over against each other. For convenience we adopt the following form:

PROPOSITION—Immigration should be further restricted by law.

*Affirmative argument*

Immigration should be further restricted, because

I. It is a detriment to the country, for

1. We now admit extreme socialists and anarchists
2. They form undesirable groups of foreigners in the congested parts of cities
3. They lower the standard of living of the American workman.
4. Many of the immigrants now admitted do not make good citizens.

II. The present laws are not satisfactory, for

1. Black Hand societies show that undesirable persons are admitted.
2. Diseased persons are admitted.
3. Steamship lines help to evade the immigrant laws.
4. Paupers are admitted.

III. We do not need all the immigrants now coming to us, for

1. The great necessity for laborers to develop our natural resources has passed.

*Negative argument*

Immigration should not be further restricted, because

I. It is a benefit to the country, for

1. The worst elements are now excluded.
2. They are soon assimilated.
3. They furnish examples of thrift to American workmen.
4. They ultimately become good citizens.

II. The present laws are satisfactory, for

1. No law would exclude all undesirable immigrants.
2. All persons having contagious diseases are excluded.
3. Custom house officials are diligent in enforcing the laws.
4. Paupers are not admitted.

III. We need all the immigrants now coming to us, for

1. We need them to develop our natural resources.

By contrasting the arguments thus tabulated we derive the following main issues.

I. Is immigration under existing conditions a detriment or a benefit to the country?

(The answer depends upon the answers to these subordinate questions.)

1. Is the undesirable element excluded?
2. Have the immigrants assimilated readily?
3. Do they exert a detrimental influence upon the standard of living of the American workman?
4. Do they make good citizens?



## II. Are the present laws satisfactory?

1. Are they the most effective in excluding undesirable immigrants that it is possible to enact?
2. Do they exclude diseased persons?
3. Do the present laws exclude paupers?
4. Are the present laws enforced?

## III. Do we need all the immigrants now coming to us?

1. Do we still need all the immigrants we can get to develop our natural resources?

This arrangement of the affirmative and negative arguments places the whole matter, so far as it has been worked out, before the student in tangible form. It also affords a basis for the formal statement of the main issues. The plan of analysis thus set forth should now be examined with a critical eye. Here arise some of the most difficult problems of argumentation. In the first place, is the analysis presented an exhaustive one? Does it include the entire field of argument? It includes the proposed immigration laws and their probable effects. It includes the present laws and their effects. From these two facts it is evident that the analysis covers the entire field of the proposed change in the immigration laws.

Before passing final judgment upon the thoroughness of the analysis, there are at least two other plans which may be applied to the question to see whether either of them will afford a better method of treatment than the foregoing. The first of these plans includes the division of the question into three parts; viz. (1) political, (2) social, and (3) economic. An examination of the question just discussed will show that all the material suggested in the formal analysis could be grouped under one or the other of these heads. For example, the anarchists, Black Hand societies, etc., would come under "political"; the question of assimilation would come under "social"; while the effect upon the American workman and the question of the development of our natural resources would come under "economic."

This division may be applied to many questions, but it is well suited to only a limited number. In fact, some eminent authorities are of the opinion that it is almost never to be recommended. It is not as well adapted to the immigration question as the division already made, for the reason that it would be necessary to include some of the subject-matter under two separate heads. For example, the Little Spains, Little Italys, etc., mentioned above, might require treatment under the social and political divisions

and even under the heading of economics. This is objectionable, because it requires a duplication of the statement of facts under each head, and also because it is not conducive to the clean, clear-cut thinking which is the result of a sharp division of the subject into parts which do not overlap.

The second plan of analysis, which forms a good working basis for many propositions, is that of dividing the subject into three parts, namely, (1) Necessity, (2) Practicability, and (3) Justice. This division of the subject is often applicable to propositions which advocate the adoption of some new plan of action, as, "Resolved, That the Federal Government should levy a progressive inheritance tax," or "Resolved, That cities of the United States, having a population of over 5000, should adopt the commission form of government."

These and similar questions may be analyzed by one of the two plans stated above, but it is well to beware adopting one or the other of these methods merely because it affords an easy way out of the task of analyzing the proposition. That analysis of a question should be adopted which reveals the main issues of the proposition in the clearest and most direct manner.

#### SUMMARY OF ESSENTIAL STEPS IN ANALYSIS

1. A broad view of the subject.
2. The origin and history of the question.
3. Definition of terms.
4. Narrowing the question.
  - (1) Excluding irrelevant matter.
  - (2) Admitting matters not vital to the argument.
5. Contrasting the affirmative arguments with those of the negative.

#### THE MAIN ISSUES

The process of analysis with which we are dealing has revealed the main issues of the proposition. It now becomes the duty of the debater to arrange the issues in logical and climactic order. The most forcible array of argument should come at the end. For example, in the question just analyzed the logical as well as the climactic order of arrangement for the main issues of the affirmative would be as follows:

- I. The present laws are not satisfactory.
- II. We do not need all the immigrants now coming to us.
- III. Immigration (under the present system) is a detriment to the country.

This analysis should be the result of a thorough study of both sides of the whole proposition. If the task has been well done no change in the essential elements of the analysis will become necessary. However, as the investigation of the subject progresses, and the work of collecting evidence leads the student into a more intimate acquaintance with the proposition, it may be found advisable to make some alterations in the analysis first written out. Such alterations should be made only after careful deliberation, for it often happens that, in investigating a subject at close range, one loses the broad general view which is necessary to an intelligent analysis. It may even become necessary for a beginner to change his entire plan after he has made a more thorough investigation of the subject. In such an event the work originally spent in analysis should not be regarded as lost, because it is absolutely necessary that the student have some definite plan as a basis for his investigation. If it does no more than show him that he is wrong, the time spent on it cannot be said to be wasted. In any event, the student should keep his mind open for the reception of ideas which will make his analysis clearer, briefer, and more forcible.

### 3. EVIDENCE

#### *a. Collecting and Recording Material for Evidence*

After the question has been analyzed and the main issues determined, the next step is to obtain material by which to prove the truth or falsity of the arguments that have been revealed by the analysis. In the work that the student has already done he has obtained a great deal of information. It is necessary, however, to study the question exhaustively in order that every possible bit of information may be secured that will assist in proving his side of the question or in refuting the arguments of his opponents. The material required for such proof is termed evidence.

#### SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

The first question that naturally arises in the mind of the debater is "where may evidence be obtained?"

First of all the debater should examine his own mind to determine just how much he really knows about the subject

and should set down every fact and argument which he can discover, being careful, however, to distinguish between what is exact knowledge and what is mere conjecture. He should also talk the subject over with his friends. It is also practicable to solicit the opinions of men and women who are known to be especially interested in the question for debate and who are in a position to have special knowledge concerning it. Personal letters and interviews, when backed up by the names of people who are really authoritative on the subject, form valuable evidence.

By far the larger part of the evidence, however, must be obtained from the reading of many books, pamphlets and magazine articles on the subject. The most practical and economical way to begin is for the student to make a bibliography. This should be put on cards—3x5 cards are most often used—and only one reference should be put on each card. For such a bibliography the student may consult the following sources:

**SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES.** Bibliographies especially prepared are often available on the question chosen for debate. Many such bibliographies are published by the Library of Congress. These can be secured from the Superintendent of Documents at Washington, D.C., or, in many cases, from the Public Affairs Information Service, 11 West 40th Street, New York City. Information as to such bibliographies may be found through the United States Catalog, the bulletins of the Public Affairs Information Service, or the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Public Documents issued by the Superintendent of Documents. Many of the manuals for debate, debaters' handbooks and similar sources furnish bibliographies, articles, arguments or briefs on current subjects. Sources of such material have been listed in Appendix II at the close of this volume.

**GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES.** For books and pamphlets on the subject chosen, consult the United States Catalog, Books in Print January 1, 1928, the supplementary annual volumes, and the current numbers of the Cumulative Book Index. Also consult the subject index to the A.L.A. Booklist and the annual volumes and current numbers of the Book Review Digest. The card catalogs of your nearest libraries that are accessible will also reveal much material on the subject. For articles from periodicals most easily available in the average school or public library

consult the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, cumulations and current numbers for 1900 to date. Other indexes to periodicals are the International Index to Periodicals, formerly the Readers' Guide Supplement, 1907 to date and the Magazine Subject Index, 1907 to date. If the subject has legal aspects, many references to it may be found in the Index to Legal Periodicals and Law Library Journal which has been published since 1908. The Industrial Arts Index, 1913 to date, will furnish references to periodicals relating to industry and business, and, likewise, subjects relating to agriculture are covered by the Agricultural Index which was begun in 1916. Then there are such special indexes as the Engineering Index, Education Index, and the Quarterly Cumulative Index Medicus. For articles in periodicals published prior to 1900, consult Poole's Index, 1802-1906.

**GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS.** The discussions daily carried on in Congress on subjects of the day will often be especially valuable and a full report of these is to be found in the Congressional Record. An index is issued to each volume in which speeches and discussions will be found listed under the name of the speaker, the subject, or by the number of the bill to which reference is made. There are many other documents and reports issued by the Senate, the House, or Congressional committees and these are covered by the Index to the Subjects of the Documents and Reports issued for each session of Congress or by the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Public Documents.

**MISCELLANEOUS MATERIAL.** Organizations are often formed for the purpose of promoting or combatting a special movement or issue and from them valuable material can frequently be obtained in the way of reports, broadsides, pamphlets, or bibliographies. For instance, material in favor of the League of Nations may be obtained from the World Peace Foundation, or, against it, from the League for the Preservation of American Independence. This material must be used with the knowledge that much of it at least is in the nature of propaganda, but, even so, it will be found valuable and timely. Then, there are many miscellaneous sources of information, such as encyclopedias, dictionaries, yearbooks and statistical almanacs which will be of considerable service in furnishing facts and figures. Encyclopedias are especially valuable, if up to date, because they present a full view of the subject in a nutshell, and often list references to other material also. Another useful source of miscellaneous

information is the bulletins of the Public Affairs Information Service already referred to.

After the bibliography has been prepared the student should set about the reading of the material. Often the mass of material is voluminous and it is necessary that he select carefully in order not to waste his time. Some of the articles will be shown to be worthless at a glance. Some of them are irrelevant, others so stupid as not to be worth reading. These should be discarded at once. The student should not read hastily, merely to cover the ground, but every article should be thoroughly studied. William Trufant Foster says:<sup>1</sup>

Make your reading, not a process of indiscriminate accumulation of evidence, good or bad, but a conscious, intelligent selective process. Read critically. Challenge the writer at every turn. Is he fair? Is he accurate? Is he consistent? Is he careless? Is he competent? Is he prejudiced? Does he exaggerate? Has anything happened since the article was written to make the author's conclusions false? Long periods of continued reflection bear much fruit. Frequent discussion with debating colleagues and other friends may result in clarifying a hazy problem.

It is necessary that the debater read not only the material on his side of the subject but that of his opponent's also. Part of his argument will consist of the refutation of arguments put forth on the opposing side. He must know not only what are the arguments his opponents will put forth but just what evidence he must use to break them down. He must also know what evidence the opposing side will use to tear down his own arguments, in order to be able to prove his own side most effectively.

The search for facts and arguments should continue up to the last day of the debate. The student should not feel prepared until he has investigated every bit of evidence that may be of use in preparing his own side or in destroying the arguments of his opponents.

As he reads it is necessary to test the evidence. He should distinguish in the first place between undisputed facts which are acceptable to both sides and disputed facts which must depend upon their source for authoritativeness. He should guard against using statements which have not a sufficient authority back of them to provide for their acceptance by the opposing side. In his reading the debater should see that the statements quoted from authorities are quoted first hand and exactly as

<sup>1</sup> Essentials of Exposition and Argument. p. 31.

stated. Error is liable to creep into statements made by second-hand authorities.

#### RECORDING THE EVIDENCE

As the student reads he should make full and accurate notes of all material found that is likely to prove valuable for evidence. When an article contains a good point for or against a given argument, the gist of the article should be noted down as clearly and concisely as possible. Statistics should be tabulated. When men or women of authority give an opinion, this should be quoted. Care should be taken in noting evidence that it be transcribed accurately. Figures should be compared with the original source to make sure no errors have crept in. Quotations should be copied word for word as originally uttered, enclosed in quotation marks, and the full source of the quotation, author, volume and page should be added.

The most convenient record for notes is the 3x5 card. These cards are easily obtainable and are of a convenient size for handling, both in the work of preparing the debate and on the platform. They are also easy to file and can be very easily preserved for future reference.

In using the cards care should be taken to put one point only on each card. At the head of the card should be put the argument or subject covered by this particular bit of evidence. At the bottom should be given the source from which the article is taken. The body of the card is thus reserved for evidence itself which should be copied in a clear, concise manner and should be exact.

As far as possible, only one card should be made for each point. Otherwise the evidence becomes scattered. If, however, it is necessary to make more than one card, all the cards containing evidence on a single point should be fastened together, or linked by a system of numbering, A1, A2, etc.

By having but one point only on the card, the cards can be arranged in order of the arguments to be used and can be shifted to meet any change in order that may prove desirable. Arranged in this manner, they really present the whole argument in its proper order, and the brief can be developed very easily from the cards.

The debater will find, as he proceeds with his reading, that he has taken several times the amount of evidence that he will

be able to use. This is inevitable. He will find, however, that some evidence is duplicated or is comparatively valueless and can be dropped out. Other evidence that cannot be used in the main speech will be valuable in rebuttal.

The following rules laid down by William Trufant Foster may profitably be adopted by every student as the most convenient method of procedure in the reading for and recording of evidence.

#### TAKING NOTES OF EVIDENCE<sup>1</sup>

In taking notes of evidence, it is advisable to observe the following rules:

1. Use cards or sheets of paper of uniform size, and write only on one side.
2. Place on one card or one sheet of paper only evidence relating to a single sub-topic.
3. Quote from the original sources unless you are forced to use a second-hand source.
4. Take few notes until you have defined the question, and secured a general idea of the controversy and a tentative set of issues.
5. Select those words which bear most cogently and tersely on the point at issue.
6. In making note of material for refutation, state exactly the argument to be refuted.
7. Always make an exact reference to the source at the time when you make note of evidence.
8. References to sources should, as a rule, specify author, title, date, edition, volume, and page.
9. Quote exactly, and use quotation marks.
10. Indicate omissions by means of dots, thus: . . .
11. When you supply your own words inside a quotation, inclose them in brackets, [thus].
12. Indicate at the top of each card the main subject or issue to which the evidence relates, and the sub-topic.
13. Employ a definite system in arranging your evidence.
14. Take more notes than you think you can possibly use. Only the fittest will survive.

<sup>1</sup> *Essentials of Exposition and Argument*. p. 33.



*b. How to Estimate and Present the Evidence*<sup>1</sup>

## KINDS OF EVIDENCE

Broadly speaking, there are two kinds of evidence, *testimonial* and *circumstantial*, sometimes called, respectively, *direct* and *indirect* evidence.

*Testimonial* evidence is the statements of witnesses as to facts, and the opinions of authorities recognized as specialists in their line. It may be either oral or in writing. If the question should arise as to whether or not a certain student should be barred from the football team for rough playing, the statements of persons who saw the student play would be testimonial evidence of the oral kind. A statement in a report of the Commissioner of Immigration to the effect that 150,000 immigrants from Europe entered the United States in 1928, would be written testimonial evidence as to a fact. All such statements as to facts from reports, books, pamphlets, magazine articles, etc., are illustrations of written testimonial evidence.

If Senator Borah, during the course of an address, were to say that, in his opinion, the United States should join the League of Nations, that would be recognized generally as the opinion of an authority on a subject of which he has special knowledge.

Were the president of the American Federation of Labor to state editorially in the *American Federationist* that he believed a separate Labor Party in the United States would best advance the cause of labor in this country, such a statement would be generally recognized as the opinion of an authority on that subject, and would be written testimonial evidence of the second kind. Statements of *opinions*, in the form of quotations from books, magazines, encyclopedias, dictionaries, etc., are examples of testimonial evidence of this class.

*Circumstantial* evidence has been defined as reasoning from facts. For example, if driving along the highway, we see in an adjoining field a wagon turned over, the tongue broken, and parts of the whiffle-trees at some distance, we *reason* from these facts that there has been a runaway. If we should view a set of slides showing the status of agriculture in different parts of the world, and see that in large portions of the earth agriculture is still in a most primitive stage, with hardly any farm machinery, little or no attention paid to seed, and no adaptation of crops to

<sup>1</sup> Gislason, H. B. *Effective Debating*, p. 17-27. Univ. of Minn. 1914. (The selection quoted has been rewritten for this Edition of the Manual.)

soils, we should probably be justified in inferring that the marvellous development of agriculture in the United States is due in large measure to American inventive genius and the work of agricultural schools, both of which are missing in the more primitive regions.

The following quotations illustrate the two kinds of evidence:

### *Testimonial Evidence—*

Some of the simpler forms recommended by the Simplified Spelling Board merit adoption. More than one half are preferred by Webster's dictionary, more than six tenths are preferred by the Century dictionary, and two thirds are preferred by the Standard dictionary. Nearly all the rest are allowed by all three dictionaries as alternative spellings in good usage. And if the authority of the dictionaries is not sufficient, why not accept the authority of the greatest names in English literature? The appearance of the simpler forms, blest, dropt, stept, stopt, and the like, in the works of Spenser, Shakespeare, Jonson, Bacon, Raleigh, and the rest, was no innovation but was the accepted usage of the age. Besides the forms mentioned in the list, Spenser has askt, laught, purchast, and the like in endless profusion. Shakespeare has similar forms on every page of the original texts. Ben Jonson (in his *Workes*, 1616) has checkt, dismist, lockt, and the like. Milton, Fuller, Bunyan, Cowley, Butler, Dryden, Addison, Pope, Thomson, Goldsmith, and all their contemporaries use similar forms, as do such modern writers as Scott, Keats, Lamb, Landor and Tennyson. Surely the common or frequent use of a spelling by nearly all the standard authors justifies its acceptance or resumption by present writers.—Foster. *Argumentation and Debating*. p. 55.

### *Circumstantial Evidence—*

The anomalies and perversities of English spelling call loudly for simplification. There is a widespread conviction that the English language, in its progress toward becoming an international language, is hampered by this one thing—its intricate and disordered spelling, which makes it a puzzle to the stranger within our gates and to the stranger beyond the seas. It is a burden to every writer of English. It wastes much of the time, money, and energy expended in the instruction of our children. Moreover, the printing, typewriting, and handwriting of the useless letters which encumber our spelling waste every year millions of dollars. Since, then, the reasonable and gradual simplification of our spelling will aid the spread of English, with the attendant advancement of commerce, of democratic ideals, and of intellectual and political freedom; will economize the time of our school children and make their work more efficient, and will in numerous other ways economize both time and money, this reform should commend itself to common sense, to patriotism, and to philanthropy.—Foster. *Argumentation and Debating*. p. 56.

## I. TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE

**HOW TO JUDGE TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE.**—The larger part of most arguments is based on testimonial evidence. Of the numberless questions that invite discussion, few people have any

first-hand knowledge, that is, knowledge based on their own observation. We are therefore forced to depend on the record of other people's observation and the conclusions they have reached on the basis of those observations. It becomes obviously important, then, that we shall be able to appreciate the strength and weakness of any given piece of testimonial evidence. Before we can properly value any statement of opinion, the following tests should be applied:

(1) *What special knowledge of the question is the authority known to possess?* On the basis of this one test alone, the value of evidence may vary from virtually nothing to something that approaches conclusiveness. Suppose the question is whether or not the United States and Canada should build the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. The mere opinion of the ordinary person with no special knowledge of the question, approaches zero in value. The opinion of a college professor of engineering may be worth something, depending on the opportunities he has had of investigating the question. With no special knowledge his opinion is not worth much. Suppose now that a commission of capable civil engineers, headed by some one world renowned in that field, were to make an exhaustive study and investigation of the project, occupying months and perhaps years in the labor, and then should publish its findings as to the feasibility of the waterway in detailed form, it would be clear that the conclusions of such a commission would outweigh any number of off-hand opinions based on little or no information.

It is well to avoid quoting indiscriminately opinions that have little to recommend them but the fact that the men holding them are in the public eye. The fact that a man is well known does not make him an authority on all subjects. Unless it can be shown that he is a student of the question, has some knowledge of it, his opinion is not worth much. Debating teams often write letters to these public men, asking for their opinions on the question to be debated, with a view to quoting such opinions in the debate. That kind of evidence is *prohibited* in many intercollegiate debates. It is, for instance, ruled out by the constitution of the Central Debating Circuit of America, which is made up of five of the state universities of the Middle West. The objection to such evidence is that off hand opinions are worth very little, and that leading questions are often asked in such letters, the effect being to represent unfairly the views of the writer.

(2) *Is the authority prejudiced?* Just as *thorough knowledge of the question* is the one most important consideration that *gives weight* to an opinion, so *prejudice* is likely to be the one most important consideration that *detracts from its value*. Most people see things through the eye-glass of their own interests and come to conclusions correspondingly colored. The tendency for all is to hold opinions that are convenient rather than those that are correct. A farmer who finds that a costly gravelled highway, built largely at the expense of the state and county, will run by the side of his farm, is quite sure that it was laid out in the very best manner possible; while another farmer, three miles distant from this costly road, is unable to see the wisdom of it so clearly. No one who has heard the testimony of witnesses in a court of law can have failed to observe at what different angles different witnesses see the same facts. The angle between the line of probable truth and the line of vision is usually the angle of prejudice.

The extent to which prejudice may bind even educated people is well illustrated by an editorial that appeared in an Omaha paper during the presidential campaign of 1911. One of the editors of this Republican paper, not knowing that the plank criticized was actually one in the platform of his own party, severely criticized one of the planks in the Republican platform. So completely was this editor color-blinded by partisan feeling that what ordinarily would have appeared pure white, through the lens of party prejudice looked slaty-gray, if not coal-black.

It requires discriminating judgment to make proper allowance for the peculiar interests that influence people. The testimony of the president of a steamship company to the effect that subsidies were needed by his line for a certain kind of service, is likely to be highly colored. The opinions of labor leaders that the injunction in labor disputes should be abolished, must be discounted, for they have an interest in doing away with so powerful an instrument against them. The statement of a mayor elected under the commission form of government to the effect that the commission form of government has been successful in his city, can hardly be accepted at its face value without corroboration. The weight of an authority, or the value of a particular piece of evidence frequently becomes an issue in a debate, and the skilful debater will use only such authorities as he is prepared to defend.

(3) The two tests just given will determine with fair accuracy the weight to be given an authority in a debate. There are other tests to be applied especially to witnesses as to facts. It goes without saying that the testimony of a witness must be consistent with itself, with human experience, and with other known facts in the case. The testimony of a witness, given reluctantly, is usually regarded as trustworthy, as is testimony given against the interest of the witness. Perhaps the most important thing to consider, in addition to the two main tests, is whether the audience is likely to *accept* the authorities quoted. The same authorities do not always have the same weight with different audiences. The opinions of such men as Shipstead, Norris, and Brookhart, have more weight with audiences in the Northwest than in the East. The opinions of Mellon, Hughes, and Coolidge, have more weight in the East than they have in the Northwest. The opinions of the latter would have more weight with audiences composed largely of business men, while those of the former would be likely to have more weight with popular audiences. In a debate on the value of large business mergers before a popular audience in the Northwest, it would, therefore, be significant to show that Shipstead and Norris strongly opposed such mergers, while it would be of doubtful value for the other side to show that Mellon and Hughes favor them.

The point is, use authorities that your audience will accept. *The acceptance of an authority by the audience is the final test from which there is no appeal.*

HOW TO PRESENT TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE.—Having selected the best evidence available, the debater should next present it in such a manner as to make the audience appreciate the value of it. The opinion of an investigating commission may be worth a hundred times as much as that of a magazine writer, and the speaker may know it, and yet present the two in such a way as to have them make about the same impression on an audience. It is not uncommon to hear authorities quoted in debates about whom the audience knows little or nothing. To use the opinion of a man who is unknown to the audience, without informing them as to what right the man has to testify on the question, is practically a waste of time. To quote a weighty authority, without making clear the weight of it, is even worse.

It should be borne in mind that the aim of an argument is to influence human minds. To use an illustration from Beecher,

it is not to be regarded as a Chinese firecracker, to be fired off for the noise it makes. Every bit of evidence should make a definite impression. To say, "Mr. Smith, writing in the North American Review, says so and so," makes very little impression, unless the hearers are informed who Mr. Smith is, what knowledge he has of the question, and what qualification he has, in general, for giving an opinion. It is not enough to say, "The committee of the House of Commons, appointed to investigate shipping subsidies, recommend that no general subsidies be given." To quote the commission effectively, it should be made plain what was the personnel of the commission, what witnesses testified before it, how thorough an investigation was made, and how voluminous the report. It will add much to the weight of the recommendations of such a commission if it be made known to the audience that the inquiry of the commission is perhaps the most extensive ever made into shipping subsidies, covering as it does the subsidy policies of the leading nations of the world.

(1) Never quote an unknown authority without giving proper explanation as to who the writer is, and why you regard his opinion as worth something.

(2) When you present what you think is a strong piece of evidence, be sure you make your hearers understand why it is strong.

## II. CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

HOW TO ESTIMATE CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.—Circumstantial evidence has been defined as reasoning from facts. From the fact that a large number of towns and cities have tried the commission form of government and found it in the main satisfactory, we conclude that the city of M—— would find it satisfactory. It is reasoning from facts already known to an unknown conclusion.

There are, broadly speaking, three kinds of arguments based on circumstantial evidence: (1) argument from *generalization*, (2) argument from *analogy*, and (3) argument based on *causal relationship*.

### *Argument from Generalization*

Suppose we have observed that wheat sown in southern Minnesota after May 5 always yields a poor return. Suppose, in conversation with others, we find that their observation and experience have been the same. From these known instances

that wheat sown after the 5th of May has yielded poorly, we may conclude that *in all cases* when wheat is sown so late in southern Minnesota it is likely to yield poorly. Here we have a conclusion as to a *whole class* of similar phenomena, based on the observation of a number of related particular instances. That is a generalization. It is a conclusion reached with reference to a whole class from a number of known examples or instances. From the large number of instances known of late fall plowing producing a poor crop of wheat the next year, we feel safe in concluding that all fields plowed late in the fall will produce poor crops of wheat.

There are four tests of this argument:

- (1) Is there a sufficiently large number of observed, as compared with the unobserved, instances to warrant the conclusion?
- (2) Are the instances observed fair specimens of the class?
- (3) Are there any known exceptions?
- (4) Is there a reasonable probability that such a general statement is true?

Let us examine briefly these tests.

(1) *The relative number of observed and unobserved instances.*—Of the four, this test means the least. The relative number of observed instances may have very little to do with the validity of the conclusion. In some cases, a single instance may support a conclusion; in others nothing short of all the instances of a class will support it. For example, if a chemist should discover that two new elements combine in new proportions to form an unknown compound, that single instance would be enough to warrant the conclusion that these elements would always so combine. On the other hand, nothing short of a complete enumeration would support the generalization that all the members of the National House of Representatives were over thirty-five years of age. In the illustration of the wheat only a few instances would justify a conclusion. To support the conclusion that during the last twenty-five years labor unions have shown tendencies that are detrimental to the best interests of the country, it would be necessary to reckon with a large number of unions, perhaps a majority in number.

(2) *Are the instances observed fair specimens?*—The conclusion that late-sown wheat will yield poorly would find confirmation by this test. Unless it could be shown that in the

instances observed the seed was poor, or the ground naturally poor, or poorly prepared, those instances should prove fair examples. The conditions are much the same in one place as in another. On the other hand, the success of the Brotherhood of Railway Engineers in making collective agreements with their employers without insisting on the closed shop, would not be a fair example from which to prove that other unions may make equally successful agreements. The conditions in that occupation are peculiar. The Brotherhood of Engineers is protected by a long apprenticeship. Their labor is highly skilled, requiring generally years of preparation. It is, moreover, a hazardous occupation. These conditions greatly limit competition and enable men in this occupation to demand high wages. Industries employing unskilled labor present conditions so different as to make the instance above given of very little value for the reason that it is *not a fair specimen*.

(3) *Are there any known exceptions?*—In many communities the notion prevails that it always rains on the Fourth of July. If the records of weather on that day were available, they would probably show so many exceptions as to make the generalization worthless. If many instances could be shown of late plowing producing good crops of wheat the next year, those instances would impair the validity of the generalization that late plowing for wheat always produces poor crops. If no such examples could be shown, the generalization would stand, by this test.

(4) *Is there a probability that such a general law exists?*—This is, perhaps, the most important test of the argument from generalization. Aside from any examples of fact, it is possible to show very good reasons why we may expect poor wheat from late sowing; why it is absurd to think that it will necessarily rain on the Fourth of July any more than on the fifth; why labor unions cannot, in general, make successful collective agreements with their employers so long as the doors are open to non-union men. Similarly there is no probable reason to suppose that all the members of the National House of Representatives were over thirty-five years of age. We cannot quite accept any generalization as being true until we know the *reasons* for its being true; in other words, until we can account for its being true in terms of *causes* and *effects*. It can be shown that there are causes operating in the case of private monopolies



to produce the effect of high prices; that there are causes working to make collective bargaining difficult in an open shop, while no causes can be shown to produce the effect of rain on the fourth, any more than on the fifth, of July.

### *Argument from Analogy*

The argument from analogy is based on circumstantial evidence. It is essentially an inference that, because two things or relationships are alike in certain known particulars, they are probably alike in certain unknown particulars. For instance, in a certain experiment with deep and shallow plowing for oats, it was found that a field plowed four inches deep yielded twenty-seven bushels an acre, while an adjoining field plowed ten inches deep yielded seventy-seven bushels an acre. If a farmer were to conclude that by plowing ten inches deep for oats he, too, could raise as much as seventy-seven bushels an acre, he would reason by analogy. The two undertakings would be alike in certain known particulars: the soil in the two places would, perhaps, be much the same; so would be the seed, climate, rainfall, time of planting, etc. These are the points of *known resemblance*. From these we infer that the two examples would be alike in the one *unknown particular*, namely, the big yield. In the same way we might infer that because in England the British Labor Party has made such rapid progress and won such signal success, a Labor Party organized in the United States, in much the same way, would be successful here. Just in so far as it can be shown that conditions affecting the progress of such a party are alike in the two countries, just so far our inference would be valid. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that conditions in certain vital respects are essentially different, e.g., that labor receives a fairer share of the national income here than it does in Great Britain, then that would be a vital fact to reckon with, and would affect the conclusion drawn. We infer that because the City Manager plan has worked well in some cities, it will work well in others.

It will be seen that the argument is much like the generalization. Both are inductive arguments, based on examples. The difference is that in the argument from generalization we usually have a considerable number of instances on which to base our inference, and we base our conclusion on the assumption that what is true of the instances or examples *observed*, is true of

the *whole class* of such related instances; while in the analogy there is frequently only one, or at most, only a very few examples, the inference being based on the *resemblances* between the instances given rather than on any general truth with reference to *all* such instances.

Sometimes the analogy is a comparison of relationships rather than matters of fact. In that form the analogy is more of an illustration than an argument. Webster used this form of analogy in opening his reply to Hayne.

Mr. President, when the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence, and, before we float farther on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may, at least, be able to conjecture where we now are. I ask for the reading of the resolution before the Senate.

In testing the validity of an analogy, it is well to bear in mind the following:

(1) *Are the two examples alike in all essential particulars?*

—By *essential particulars* are meant those that are necessary to reach a conclusion as to the point at issue. If, in the instance given above, of late plowing for wheat, the rainfall in the first example was thirty inches a year and in the second only fifteen inches a year, there would have been a dissimilarity in an essential particular that would render the analogy worthless. With a rainfall of only fifteen inches a year, it is impossible to predict a big crop of wheat, no matter how early the plowing. If one were to argue that there is life on the moon from the known resemblances of conditions on the moon's surface to those on the earth, the known fact that the moon has no atmosphere would prove fatal to the analogy. Atmosphere is a condition indispensable to life, and the two examples prove to be *dissimilar* in an *essential particular*.

Some times the conditions of the analogy are such as to make the resemblance of known particulars more favorable to the example in question than to that of the analogy. Take, for instance, the organization of a Labor Party in the United States. If it can be shown that labor is better organized and unified in the United States than in England, as exemplified by the American Federation of Labor, then in that respect, at least, conditions would be more favorable for the rapid growth of such

a party in this country. This, of course, is only one aspect of a large question, and other conditions might easily make the analogy of doubtful validity.

(2) *Are the facts on which the analogy is based really true?*—This is always a pertinent question to ask. If it can be shown that the City Manager form of municipal government has not been successful in the cities where it has been tried, but that whatever improvements there have been in the government of those cities have been due to other causes, then those analogies would be worse than useless, as tending to show the merits of the plan.

### *Argument Based on Causal Relationship*

There are two kinds of arguments based on causal relationship. One is an inference from cause to effect; the other is an inference from effect to cause. The argument from *cause to effect* is based on matters *before* the fact in dispute. The argument from *effect to cause* is based on matters *after* the fact in dispute.

(1) *The argument from cause to effect.*—When, on a hot afternoon in July, one sees dense, black clouds rolling up in the west, the wind stilled to a dead calm, lightning flashing around the sky, followed by roars of thunder, one expects a rainstorm. From these causes one infers the almost certain effect of rain and wind. From the recent increases in the tariff on certain farm products, we infer that better prices will be received by farmers on those products. Similarly, we reason that if competitive building of armaments among the nations continues, wars among them will happen from time to time. The presence of large armaments is regarded by many as an important contributing cause for wars, on the theory that if the armaments are there, occasions will inevitably arise for using them. All these are illustrations of arguments from cause and effect, sometimes called arguments from *antecedent probability*.

(2) *Argument from effect to cause.*—Many people in Minnesota will remember that in the summer of 1910, in late August, the atmosphere was filled with a whitish smoke of a more or less pronounced odor. This smoky phenomenon lasted all of two days and part of a third, the smoke being at times so dense as to obscure the sun. Here was a definite effect, with the cause

at least temporarily unknown. Those who did not believe that the day of judgment was at hand, probably ascribed the smoke to its true cause—forest fires in the West. From the *known effect*, the smoke, the inference was to the *unknown cause*, forest fires.

Lincoln uses this argument to show that the fathers of our government did not expect the country to endure forever half slave and half free, but that they meant to put slavery where the public mind rested in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction.

I entertain the opinion, upon evidence sufficient to my mind, that the fathers of this government placed that institution where the public mind did rest in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. Let me ask why they made provision that the source of slavery—the African slave-trade—should be cut off at the end of twenty years? Why did they make provision that in all the new territory we owned at that time slavery should be forever inhibited? Why stop its spread in one direction, and cut off its source in another, if they did not look to its being placed in the course of its ultimate extinction?

Again: the institution of slavery is only mentioned in the Constitution of the United States two or three times, and in neither of these cases does the word "slavery" or "negro race" occur; but covert language is used each time, and for a purpose full of significance. What is the language in regard to the prohibition of the African slave-trade? It runs about this way: "The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight."

The next allusion in the Constitution to the question of slavery and the black race is on the subject of the basis of representation, and there . . . it says "persons," not slaves, not negroes; but this "three-fifths" can be applied to no other class among us than the negroes.

Lastly, in the provision for the reclamation of fugitive slaves, it is said: "No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." There again there is no mention of the word "negro" or of slavery. In all three of these places, being the only allusions to slavery in the instrument, covert language is used. Language is used not suggesting that slavery existed or that the black race were among us. And I understand the contemporaneous history of those times to be that covert language was used with a purpose and that purpose was that in our Constitution, which it was hoped and is still hoped will endure forever—when it should be read by intelligent and patriotic men, after the institution of slavery had passed from amongst us—there should be nothing on the face of the great charter of liberty suggesting that such a thing as negro slavery had ever existed among us.—Bouton. Lincoln-Douglas Debates. p. 182-4.

(3) *Tests of the arguments based on causal relationship.*—In testing the strength of these arguments, it is well to ask:

(a) Is the cause sufficient to produce the effect?

(b) Could other causes have produced or have helped to produce the effect?

(c) Is it possible to eliminate other causes than the one assigned?

A causal argument may be virtually conclusive or it may establish only a slight degree of probability. Lincoln's argument that the early fathers did not expect the country to endure permanently half slave and half free establishes at least a strong degree of probability, if it is not wholly conclusive. The scrupulous avoidance of the term "slavery" in the constitution can be accounted for only by assuming that the fathers hoped the day would come when the institution should be no more, and that they wished to leave as few traces of it in the charter of the government as possible. The inference that the smoky atmosphere in the late summer of 1910 resulted from forest fires must, for many people at least, have been practically conclusive. It was a case in which the elimination of other causes was easy. To reasoning people there was only one other cause possible—prairie fires; and anyone familiar with conditions in the northwest would soon discard that cause as next to impossible, at least at that season of the year.

In arguments from effect to cause it is frequently not so easy to eliminate other causes than the one assigned for the effect. In a recent research article in an educational magazine, the writer found that students who take Latin in high school make good records in college. To what extent is the study of Latin the *cause* of this good record? The writer hesitates to say. He realizes that there may be *several* causes. Students with native ability may have a tendency to take Latin, while others may avoid it, as it is generally regarded difficult. Or, perhaps only the more studious would select Latin. There may be several causes for the correlation found between the study of Latin and a good college record.

### c. *Refutation*<sup>1</sup>

By refutation is meant answering the arguments of opponents. It has a broader meaning than the term *rebuttal*. By

<sup>1</sup> Gislason, H. B. *Effective Debating*, p. 27-35. Univ. of Minn. 1914. (Rewritten for this edition of the Manual).

rebuttal, as applied to debating, we usually understand the second speech of a contestant in a formal debate. Work in rebuttal is therefore always concerned with refutation. But we may have refutation in the very first speech of a debate. In a debate on the merits of large business mergers, for instance, the first speaker might very properly deal with the objection that large business consolidations are usually attended with monopolistic prices, as that thought would very likely be prominent in the minds of the audience. The whole argument on that point, from the affirmative side, would be refutation, that is, it would be a reply to an objection raised by opponents. We shall treat the subject of refutation under three heads: (a) opportunities for refutation; (b) selection of refutation; (c) position of refutation.

*Opportunities for Refutation.*—In the foregoing consideration of evidence the basis has already been laid for refutation. Opportunities for replying to opponents' arguments will present themselves in proportion as those arguments fail to meet the tests already laid down. The first thing, then, is to determine what kind of arguments one's opponents are using and to detect weaknesses in them.

*Do they quote the opinions of authorities?* If they do, be sure to ask yourself do these authorities have special knowledge of the question? Have they made special investigation so that they know whereof they speak? Can you show that the authorities are prejudiced; that they have an interest in holding the opinions they do? Do you think the authorities will be accepted by the audience? Here is a field for refutation not always so well cultivated as it might be. Opinions vary as much in weight and worth as do metals.

In treating opportunities for refutation presented by inductive arguments, or those based on circumstantial evidence, we have to consider *fallacies*. It is not possible, within the allotted space, to go into a detailed discussion of fallacies. A brief survey only will be given.

## I. CLASSIFICATION OF FALLACIES

(1) *Hasty generalization.*—This fallacy results from an attempted generalization that does not comply with the tests of that argument. It can be refuted by showing that it does not

comply with one or more of the four tests. Suppose an attempt is made to show that labor unions try to restrict membership as soon as they have a closed shop. How many examples are given to show such restriction as compared with those which might be given to show the opposite? What degree of proof do two or three examples afford, out of possible hundreds? Is it reasonable to believe that such a thing would happen?

(2) *False analogy.*—This is an argument from analogy in which the example given does not comply with the tests. Can you discover a dissimilarity in some particular essential to the argument, or point at issue? Do you accept the facts on which the analogy is based?

(3) *Fallacies due to non-causal relationship.*—The tendency to affirm a causal connection between facts and phenomena where either none or insufficient ones exist, is one of the most fruitful sources of fallacy. Perhaps the most common form of this error is that of popular superstitions in which absurd and grotesque causal relations are imagined. Thirteen sit together at table; therefore one of the thirteen will surely die soon. A man builds a new house; that will surely cause a death in his family. A man forgets his umbrella; that means bad luck. Of course, we are not likely to meet with such instances in debate, instances in which *no* causal connection can possibly be shown. But we are constantly meeting arguments in which the causal relation affirmed is not nearly sure enough or strong enough to support the conclusion drawn. One instance in point is the ever recurrent argument that prosperity is the result of a certain party rule. The cause is wholly insufficient to account for so complex a phenomenon as national prosperity. There are so many other causes more important, such as good crops, efficient production, fluent money, great natural resources, etc., as to make party rule of minor import. It is still argued that the death penalty will deter crime. But when viewed in the light of its history, this seems very doubtful. It may have some effect, doubtless, but the death penalty as a deterrent is probably greatly overestimated, or in other words, there is affirmed here a causal relationship which does not exist in the degree in which it is said to exist.

Sometimes it happens that an effect is ascribed to a cause that did not begin to operate until after the specific effect or similar effects had taken place. Carl Schurz, in his speech

before the American Honest Money League, Chicago, 1906, denied the evil consequences of the demonetization of silver in 1873. He showed that the fall in the prices of many articles had happened before silver was demonetized, and could not therefore have been caused by it.

Are these complaints well founded? Look at facts which nobody disputes. That there has been a considerable fall in the prices of many articles since 1873 is certainly true. But was this fall caused by the so-called demonetization of silver through the act of 1873? Now, not to speak of other periods of our history, such as the period from 1846 to 1851, everybody knows that there was a considerable fall of prices, not only as to agricultural products—cotton, for instance, dropped from \$1 a pound in 1864 to 17 cents in 1871—but in many kinds of industrial products, before 1873. What happened before 1873 cannot have been caused by what happened in 1873. This is clear. The shrinkage after 1873 may, therefore, have been caused by something else.—Quoted in Baker. Principles of Argumentation. p. 5.

(4) *Fallacies of ignoring the question.* (a) *Argument ad hominem.*—This is a departure in the argument from the merits of the question to the merits of an opponent's character or conduct. If a member of a school board were opposing the introduction of a course in agriculture in the high school, and should, in the course of his argument, dwell on the fact that one of his colleagues was inconsistent in that he opposed such a course last year, he would commit this fallacy. The fact that one member of the board had changed his mind in favor of the course during the year, certainly was nothing against the merits of the course.

Douglas used this kind of argument in the debate with Lincoln at Freeport. The question at issue was, why Douglas and his adherents in Congress did not vote for a certain measure known as the Chase amendment, since it merely expressed more specifically what Douglas and his followers maintained was the object of the law.

He [Chase] offered his amendment for the identical purpose for which Mr. Lincoln is using it—to enable demagogues in the country to try and deceive the people. . . . He offered it, as he has himself avowed over and over again, simply to make capital out of it for the stump. He expected that it would be capital for small politicians in the country and that they would make an effort to deceive the people with it; and he was not mistaken, for Lincoln is carrying out the plan admirably.

(b) *Argument ad populum.*—This is a departure in the argument from the merits of the question to an appeal to popular prejudices and feelings.



In the Lincoln-Douglas debate at Freeport, Lincoln asked Douglas this question: If the Supreme Court of the United States shall decide that a state cannot exclude slavery from its own limits, will you submit to it? Lincoln had very good reasons for asking the question and should have received a reply on the merits. The following is, in substance, Douglas's answer, which does not go to the merits of the question, but holds Lincoln up to scorn and ridicule for casting reflections on the supreme court.

I am amazed that Lincoln should ask such a question. ("A schoolboy knows better.") Yes, a schoolboy does know better. Mr. Lincoln's object is to cast an imputation upon the Supreme Court. He knows that there never was but one man in America, claiming any degree of intelligence or decency, who even for a moment pretended such a thing. . . . He might as well ask me: Suppose Mr. Lincoln should steal a horse, would I sanction it; and it would be as genteel in me to ask him, in the event he stole a horse, what ought to be done with him. He casts an imputation upon the Supreme Court of the United States, by supposing that they would violate the Constitution of the United States. I tell him that such a thing is not possible. It would be an act of moral treason that no man on the bench could ever descend to. Mr. Lincoln himself would never in his partisan feelings so far forget what was right as to be guilty of such an act.

(c) Arguing that "what has been should be."—The age of an institution or belief is no proof of its worth or correctness. Merely the fact that things "have been" is no reason why they "should be." This fallacy is scored in the following reply of William Ellery Channing to Henry Clay on the slavery question:

But this property, we are told, is not to be questioned on account of its long duration. "Two hundred years of legislation have sanctioned and sanctified negro slaves as property." Nothing but respect for the speaker could repress criticism on this unhappy phraseology. We will trust it escaped him without thought. But to confine ourselves to the argument from duration; how obvious the reply! Is injustice changed into justice by the practice of ages? Is my victim made a righteous prey because I have bowed him to the earth till he cannot rise? For more than two hundred years heretics were burned, and not by mobs, not by lynch law, but by the decrees of the councils, at the instigation of theologians, and with the sanction of the laws and religions of nations; and was this a reason for keeping up the fires, that they had burned two hundred years? In the Eastern world, successive despots, not for two hundred years, but for twice two thousand, have claimed the right of life and death over millions, and, with no law but their own will, have beheaded, bowstrung, starved, tortured unhappy men without number who have incurred their wrath; and does the lapse of so many centuries sanctify murder and ferocious power?—Quoted in Foster. *Argumentation and Debating*. p. 161.

(d) *Shifting ground.*—Whenever a man, under pressure of an argument by an opponent, abandons the proposition which he sets out to support, and takes his stand on another, similar, perhaps, but still different, he is said to *shift ground*. If in a debate on shipping subsidies, the affirmative should begin by advocating subsidies to all ships of certain speed and tonnage, and end by favoring aid to certain mail and passenger lines only, they would commit the fallacy of shifting ground. This fallacy frequently results from using a term in two different *senses*. Bryan tells a story of a man who argued that all true patriots should vote the Republican ticket because the constitution guarantees to this country a republican form of government. Here the word "republican" is used in two different senses, and results in the speaker's shifting from the proposition, we ought to vote the Republican ticket, to the proposition, we ought to comply with the Constitution.

(3) *Fallacies of begging the question.*—This fallacy consists either in assuming the truth of the proposition to be proved and making the proof depend on this assumption; or by assuming the truth of another proposition necessary to the proof of the one at issue. In either case, the fault is essentially one of *assertion*, lack of evidence. This fallacy takes several forms, among which are the following:

(a) *Arguing in a circle.*—This is to assume the truth of the proposition at issue or its equivalent in the course of the proof. For an instance, a student in a class debate asserted that the states, by lax corporation laws, bid for the business of creating corporations for the sake of the fees they get. When asked to prove that the states receive appreciable amounts of money in the form of fees, he replied that they would not be bidding for the business if they did not get big fees. This is like trying to lift one's self by pulling at one's bootstraps.

The fallacy occurs in its simplest form in the following dialogue:

*Leon.* What is it, my good friends?

*Dog.* Good man Verges, sir, speaks a little off the matter. An old man, sir, and his wits are not so blunt as, God help, I would desire they were; but in faith, honest as the skin between his brows.

*Verg.* Yes. I thank God I am as honest as any man living, that is an old man and no *honester* than I.

(b) Assuming the truth of a proposition that needs to be proved—It is probable that no fallacy is more common among amateur debaters than this, of *assuming the truth of a proposition that needs to be proved*. In the Lincoln-Douglas debates, Douglas made much of certain radical resolutions on slavery which he affirmed Lincoln had had a hand in passing. This was very damaging to Lincoln among his more conservative friends. Lincoln, on several occasions, denied having had anything to do with the passing of these resolutions. But Douglas never met the issue as to whether Lincoln did in fact help pass these resolutions, but simply held them up as a horrible example of Lincoln's radical views. Douglas thus consistently begged the question by *assuming* the fact of Lincoln's connection with these resolutions, in the face of Lincoln's denials.

(c) Using "question-begging" words.—It happens that, both in the statement of questions for debate and in the course of arguments, words are used which, by implication, assume the truth of the proposition in dispute, and so beg the question. Resolved, That the honor system is preferable to the present *unscientific* method of dealing with criminals, is a proposition in point. The use of the word *unscientific* in the statement of the question assumes the truth of the proposition in dispute, namely, whether the honor system is more scientific than the present one. Should the *brutal* game of football be abolished, is another resolution similarly faulty. For a student in a debate to jump to the conclusion that illiterate immigrants are undesirable, and then refer to them as "these undesirable immigrants," is to use a question-begging word.

This is not a complete classification of fallacies. Probably, no such classification is possible. Enough examples have been given, however, to put the debater on his guard so that he may avoid errors in his own reasoning, and detect errors in the reasoning of others. It is often remarked that debates are won or lost by the work done in rebuttal. This is true. It is but another way of saying that *refutation is the life of a debate*. When we remember that all arguments in a debate turn on propositions which one side affirms and the other side denies, we must realize that it is not enough to offer evidence in proof of one side of those propositions: we must show that the evidence we offer, the arguments we use, are *better than those of our opponents*. Seldom do we hear debaters take

full advantage—too often they take little or no advantage—of the weaknesses of their opponents' arguments. In this connection it is well to bear in mind that it is very difficult to establish the truth of any debatable proposition with any degree of conclusiveness. It is usually easy to show that the opponents have fallen far short of *proving* any particular contention. It is always legitimate to show how far the evidence offered falls short of proving the proposition it supports.

## II. WHAT AND WHEN TO REFUTE

SELECTION OF REFUTATIONS: WHAT TO REFUTE.—It is impossible to answer all the arguments of opponents in a debate. It is neither necessary nor desirable to do so. Some may be admitted; some may not be of enough importance to require an answer; others may be unanswerable, at least directly; while a number are likely to be of such importance or such doubtful validity as to make a reply to them peculiarly fitting. For instance, in a discussion of the merits of the Prohibition Amendment, it is to be admitted that there is still much drunkenness today, and that much of the liquor drunk is more dangerous than that of pre-prohibition days. The argument that "boot-legging"—a perfectly lawless business—flourishes, is unanswerable. To try to show that these things are not so, is a waste of time, and, moreover, suggests bad faith. The most important thing to show for defenders of the Eighteenth Amendment is that liquor consumption *has greatly decreased*, and that in another generation, less used to liquor, it may largely disappear. Only such arguments should be chosen for refutation, as are *important*, and *can be more or less successfully refuted*.

Sometimes, if a speaker is *assertive*, or is extravagant in his statements, or misrepresents, it is well to give a few instances in as short a time as possible. The following is the opening of a five-minute rebuttal speech, truly effective:

It is especially essential in a debate of this character that all our evidence be firmly substantiated. The case as it stands clearly puts Leopold on trial for alleged murder in the Congo Free State. Such being the case we can not depend for our verdict on any but the surest and strongest evidence. The great fault of the evidence thus far presented by the gentlemen of the Affirmative, if I may call it a fault, is their unsupported assertion. They say that the situation in the Congo State is worse than slavery; but to prove that they must make a comparison of slavery with the conditions in the Congo Free State. This they have not done. "We know Leopold to be a

tyrannical rake," they say. They have not proved it. "His greed is self-evident," they say. We can not accept their word for it. They offer us evidence drawn from a state of affairs "too fearful to relate." If that evidence is "too fearful" to be presented in this debate, it surely can not be allowed to play any part in our decision. "The conditions of the natives' slavery are of the most abominable sort: on this point there can be no doubt," says the Affirmative. Here again the condition of comparison, to determine what is "the most abominable sort," is entirely lacking; and in regard to the question of "doubt," I have already shown that even anti-Congo agitators admit that slavery has been practically stamped out. These are a few evidences of unsupported assertion, and there are many more in our opponents' arguments.—Student Debate in Foster. Argumentation and Debating. p. 453.

The only way to determine what to refute and what not, is to analyze the question thoroughly. One must know one's opponents' strong arguments as well as one's own. One must know what may be admitted and what may not be; also what *can* be refuted and what cannot be. It is disastrous to spend much time on minor points. *Select for refutation the strongest arguments that can be refuted.*

POSITION OF REFUTATION: WHEN TO REFUTE.—Refutation may be directed either at one of the *main issues* in the debate, or at any minor proposition, argument, or detail of proof. For instance, in a debate on woman suffrage, one of the negative arguments usually is that woman suffrage would unduly interfere with woman's work in the home. This would be one of the main arguments and, therefore, one of the main issues in the debate. In answering the objection, the affirmative would be directing refutation at a *main issue*. Suppose that another main contention of the negative is that women do not want the ballot, and that they give as part proof the fact that the question was submitted to the women of Massachusetts and that only a very few expressed a desire for the suffrage. The affirmative might well reply that this happened twenty years ago, when sentiment was not nearly so strong on the question as it is at present, and that it is therefore a very poor indication of the attitude of women at the present time. In this case the reply does not go directly to the contention as to whether women want the ballot or not, but simply discredits a piece of evidence offered to prove it. In other words, refutation here goes to a very *minor proposition* in the debate, to only one of the many arguments used to prove that women do not want the ballot.

The question now arises, when, or at what place in the discussion, is it proper to refute? The answer is, *Reply to an objection whenever you think it rises in the minds of your hearers so strongly that they desire to have it answered.* This is a broad proposition, but it is the guiding principle for all refutation. It matters not whether the refutation goes to a main issue or a minor point. If the meaning of the rule is once grasped, it will answer many questions and overcome many difficulties in the planning of a debate. Let us see how it can be applied, and how it works out.

Suppose the question to be discussed is that of the foreign policy of the United States in relation to some of the smaller nations in the Western Hemisphere. Many people are thinking that our policy in Nicaragua during the past few years has not been altogether commendable. They have felt that for the United States to assume virtual control of elections there, and to carry on warfare without declaring war, has not been warranted. We may reasonably affirm then that a speaker, defending the foreign policy of the United States in relation to small nations, would find these objections prominent in the minds of his hearers, especially if well informed on the subject, even before he began his argument. What is he to do? According to the rule, *remove the objection when it appears*, at the outset. If it is possible to show that such notions are largely prejudices, or half truths, that the actions taken by the United States government have been necessary to protect property and lives of our own nationals there, and to prevent a worse disorder—then that should be done probably early in the discussion. A first speaker on the negative in a debate on this question might well begin by removing these prejudices, so far as they can be removed, and so open the debate with refutation.

Suppose one were arguing for county option before an audience hostile to prohibition, and yet in favor of local option. One might well begin by showing that county option does not mean prohibition, but that the county is simply a more logical unit than the town for the application of the local option principle. In Congress, it is said that a bill can hardly get a hearing until the question of its constitutionality has been settled.

From these examples we conclude that refutation may come first in a debate whenever there are present in the minds of the

audience objections which, if not removed, might prevent the speaker from getting a favorable hearing for his argument.

In the case of a question about which the audience has little knowledge, and on which the hearers have no prejudices or settled convictions, refutation will come later in the argument. For instance, in a debate on the question of giving the Federal Department of Education a place in the President's Cabinet, much constructive work could properly be done before any refutation would be necessary, and for the reason that no objection would be likely to arise in the minds of the average audience on that question.

In general, however, refutation and constructive work go hand in hand. Especially is this true in the case of debates in which four or more persons take part. It is a great mistake to leave all refutation for the rebuttal speeches. Strictly speaking, that, as a matter of fact, cannot happen. If there has been any analysis of the question and a resulting clash of opinion, there is bound to be refutation, even if it is not presented as such, and is not adapted to the arguments of opponents. It will lose in part its effectiveness in not being adapted to opposing arguments. Right here is one of the chronic faults of so many inter-scholastic debates, resulting from memorizing arguments word for word from beginning to end. A large degree of memorizing is inevitable and proper. There is more memorizing among platform speakers than we suspect. But for debating purposes, the unit for memorizing should be major divisions in the argument, so that some *adaptations* can be made in relation to opponents' contentions.

For instance, in a debate on the foreign policy of the United States, an affirmative speaker spent most of his time condemning the policy of the United States in Nicaragua. Now it happened that the negative speaker following had planned to devote the second half of his argument to exactly that point. What he *should* have done was to shift the order of his points and begin with defending our policy in Nicaragua *and adapt* his arguments to his opponent's. Then there would have been an interesting clash at once. A single sentence or two tactfully formulated at the beginning would have been all the extemporizing necessary. What he *did* do was to ignore completely what his opponent had said, and proceed with his argument as planned. The second half, devoted to Nicaragua, was given without showing in any

way its relation to the affirmative contentions. The speech would have been much more effective if it had been levelled at the argument of his opponent.

#### 4. CONSTRUCTING THE BRIEF<sup>1</sup>

When a builder begins the construction of a wall, he must have the proper material at hand. When an engineer begins the construction of a steel bridge, he must have metal of the right forms and shapes. Neither of these men, however, can accomplish the end which he has in mind unless he takes this material and puts it together in the proper way. So it is with the debater. He may have plenty of good evidence, but he will never win unless that evidence is organized, that is, put together in the most effective manner.

The builder, if he were building a wall of concrete, would get the correct form by pouring the concrete into a mold. So also, there is a mold which the debater should use in shaping his evidence. When the evidence has been put into this form, the debater is said to have constructed a *brief*.

In a previous lesson we saw how we might prove that John Quinn was a dangerous man by using the evidence of a court record. If we had put that evidence in brief form we should have had this:

John Quinn was a dangerous man, for:

1. He was a thief, for:

(1) The Illinois state courts found him guilty of robbing a bank, for:

a) See *Ill. Court Reports*, Vol. X., p. 83.

The brief, then, is a concise, logical outline of everything that the speaker wishes to say to the audience.

Its purpose is to indicate in the most definite form every step through which the hearers must be taken in order that the proposition may at last be fully accepted by their experience.

The brief is for the debater himself. He does not show it to the audience. It is the framework of his argument. It is the path which, if carefully marked out, will lead to success.

Now, as we have seen, there are three principal steps in debating:

1. Making clear what you wish the audience to believe.

<sup>1</sup> Lyon, L. S. *Elements of Debating. Lesson VI. Univ. of Chicago Press.* 1913.



2. Showing the audience why the establishing of certain issues should make them believe this.

3. Proving these issues.

The first two of these steps constitute what in the brief is called the *Introduction*.

The third step, proving the issues, is the largest part of the brief and is called the *Body* or the *Proof*.

In addition to these two divisions of the brief there is a sort of formal summary at the end called the *Conclusion*.

The skeleton of a brief then would be as follows:

#### INTRODUCTION

In which: (1) the desired end is made clear; (2) the issues are determined.

#### PROOF

In which the issues are stated as declarations or assertions and definite reasons are given why each one should be believed. These reasons are in turn supported by other reasons until the assertion is finally brought within the hearers' experience.

#### CONCLUSION

In which the proof is summarized.

Of course no two briefs are identical, but all must follow this general plan. Suppose we look at what might be called a model brief.

#### MODEL BRIEF

Statement of Proposition.

#### INTRODUCTION

- I. Definition of terms.
- II. Restatement of question in light of these terms.
- III. Determination of issues.
  1. Statement of what both sides admit.
  2. Statement of what is irrelevant.
- IV. Statement of the issues.

#### PROOF

- I. The first issue is true, for:
  1. This reason, which is true, for:
    - (1) This reason, for:
      - a) This reason.
      - b) This reason.

2. This reason, for:
  - (1) This evidence.
  - (2) This authority.
  - (3) This testimony, for:
    - a) See Vol. X, p. —, of report, document, magazine, or book.
- II. The second issue is true, for:
  1. This reason, for:
    - (1) This reason.
  2. This reason, for:
    - (1) This reason.
    - (2) This reason.
- III. The third issue is true, for:
  1. This reason, etc.
- IV. The fourth issue is true, for:
  1. This reason, etc.

## CONCLUSION

Therefore, since we have shown: (1) that the first issue is true by this evidence; (2) that the second issue is well founded by this evidence; (3) that the third and fourth, etc.; we conclude that our proposition is true.

Now, let us look at a special brief, made out in a high-school debate, for a special subject.

The preceding is an affirmative brief and there were four issues. In the following we have a negative brief, in which there were three issues. Refutation is introduced near the close of the proof.

## BRIEF FOR NEGATIVE

## INTRA-HIGH-SCHOOL CONTESTS SHOULD BE SUBSTITUTED FOR INTER-HIGH-SCHOOL CONTESTS IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS OF NORTHERN ILLINOIS

## INTRODUCTION

- I. Definition of terms.
  1. Contests, ordinary competitions in:
    - a) Athletics.
    - b) Debating.
  2. Intra-high-school contests (contests within each school).
  3. Inter-high-school contests (contests between different high schools).
- II. Restatement of question in light of these definitions. Contests within each high school should be substituted for contests between high schools in Northern Illinois.
- III. Determination of issues.
  1. It is admitted that:

- a) Inter and intra contests both exist at present in the high schools of northern Illinois.
- b) Contest work is a desirable form of training.
- c) Not all contests should be abolished.
- 2. Certain educators have asserted that:
  - a) The inter form of contests is open to abuses.
  - b) The intra contests would be more democratic.
  - c) Intra contests would be practicable.
- 3. Other educators disagree with these assertions.
- 4. The issues, then, are:
  - a) Are the inter contests so widely abused in the high schools of northern Illinois as to warrant their abolition?
  - b) Would the proposed plan be more democratic than the present system?
  - c) Would the proposed plan work out in practice?

#### PROOF

- I. Contests between the high schools of northern Illinois are not subject to such abuses as will warrant their abolition, for:
  - A. If the abuses alleged against athletic contests ever existed, they are now extinct, for:
    - 1. The alleged danger of injury to players physically unfit is not an existing danger, for:
      - (1) It has been made impossible by the rules of the schools, for:
        - a) This high school requires a physician's certificate of fitness before participation in any athletic contest, for:
          - (a) Extract from athletic rulings of school board.
        - b) Our opponent's high school has a similar regulation, for:
          - (a) Extract from school paper of opponents.
        - c) The X High School has the same ruling.
        - d) The Y High School has the same requirement.
    - 2. The charge that athletic contests between high schools make the contestants poor students is without sound basis, for:
      - (1) A high standard of scholarship is required of all inter-high-school athletic contestants, for:
        - a) Regulations of Illinois Athletic Association.
  - B. The evils charged against inter-high-school debating cannot be cured by the proposed scheme, for:
    - 1. They are due, when they exist, not to the form of contest, but to improper coaching, for:
      - (1) "Too much training," one of the evils charged, is an example of this.
      - (2) Unfair use of evidence, the other evil alleged, is simply an evil of improper coaching.
- II. The proposed plan would not be so democratic as the present system, for:
  - A. The present plan gives an opportunity to all students, for:

1. Its class and other intra contests give a chance to the less proficient pupils.
  2. Its inter contests afford an opportunity for the more proficient pupils.
  - B. The proposed plan would deprive the more capable pupils of desirable contests, for:
    1. They can find contests strenuous enough to induce development only by competing with similar students in other schools.
- III. The proposed plan would not be practicable, for:
- A. It is unsound in theory, for:
    1. No pupil has a strong desire to defeat his close friends.
    2. There is no desirable method of dividing the students for competition under the proposed plan, for:
      - (1) Class division is unsatisfactory, for:
        - a) The more mature and experienced upper classes win too easily.
      - (2) "Group division" is not desirable, for:
        - a) If the division is large, the domination of the mature students will give no opportunity to the younger students.
        - b) If the division is small, it is likely to develop into a secret society.
    - B. Experience opposes the proposed plan, for:
      1. College experience is against it, for:
        - (1) N. University tried this plan without success, for:
          - a) Quotation from president of N.
      2. High-school experience does not indorse it, for:
        - (1) It is practically untried in high schools.

## REFUTATION

- I. The argument which the affirmative may advance, that the experience of Shortridge High School demonstrates the success of this plan, is without weight, for:
  - A. It is not applicable to this question, for:
    1. The plan at Shortridge is not identical with the proposed plan, for:
      - (1) Shortridge has not entirely abolished inter contests, for:
        - a) School Review, October, 1911.
    2. Conditions in Shortridge differ from those in the high schools of northern Illinois, for:
      - (1) Faculty of that school has unusual efficiency in coaching, for:
        - a) Extract from letter of principal.
      - (2) Larger number of students, for:
        - a) Extract from letter of principal.

## CONCLUSION

Since there is no opportunity for serious abuse arising from contests between schools, and since the adoption of contests within the schools

alone would lessen the democracy of contests as a form of education, and since the proposed plan is impracticable in theory and has never been put into successful operation, the negative concludes that the substitution of intra for inter contests is not desirable in the high schools of northern Illinois.

From these illustrative briefs we can draw:

#### RULES FOR BRIEFING

The introduction should contain only such material as both sides will admit, or, as you can show, should reasonably admit, from the phrasing of the proposition.

Scrupulous care should be used in the numbering and lettering of all statements and substatements.

Each issue should be a logical reason for the truth of the proposition.

Each substatement should be a logical reason for the issue or statement that it supports.

Each issue in the proof and each statement that has supporting statements should be followed by the word "for."

Each reason given in support of the issues and each subreason should be no more than a simple, complete, declarative sentence.

The word "for" should never appear as a connective between a statement and substatement in the introduction.

The words "hence" and "therefore" should never appear in the proof of the brief, but one should be able to read *up* through the brief and by substituting the word "therefore" for the word "for" in each case, arrive at the proposition as a conclusion.

#### 5. DEVELOPING THE ARGUMENT FROM THE BRIEF<sup>1</sup>

When the brief is finished, the material is ready to be put into its final form. This final form is called the *forensic*.

As practically all debates are conducted by means of teams, the work of preparing the forensic is usually divided among the members of the team. The brief may be divided in any way, but it is desirable that each member of the team should have one complete, logical division. So it often happens that each member of the team develops one issue into its final form.

The forensic is nothing but a rounding-out of the brief. The brief is a skeleton: the forensic is that skeleton developed into

<sup>1</sup> Lyon, L. S. *Elements of Debating*. Lesson VII. Univ. of Chicago Press. 1913.

a complete literary form. Into this form the oral delivery breathes the spirit of living ideas.

There are two ways in which the forensic may be developed from the brief. Both have some advantages, varying with the conditions of the debate. One is to write out every word of the forensic. When this is done, the debater may, if he wishes, read from his manuscript to the audience. If he does so, his chances of making a marked effect are little better than if he spoke from the bottom of a well. The average audience will not follow the speaker who is occupied with raveling ideas from his paper rather than with weaving them into the minds of his hearers.

The debater who writes his forensic may, however, learn it and deliver it from memory. This method has some decided advantages. In every debate the time is limited; and by writing and rewriting the ideas can be compressed into their briefest and most definite form. Besides, the speaker may practice upon this definite forensic to determine the rapidity with which he must speak in order to finish his argument in the allotted time.

At the same time this plan has several unfavorable aspects. When the debater has prepared himself in this way, forgetting is fatal. He has memorized words. When the words do not come he has no recourse but to wait for memory to revive, or to look to his colleagues for help. Again, the man who has learned his argument can give no variety to his attack or defense. He is like a general with an immovable battery, who, though able to hurl a terrific discharge in the one direction in which his guns point, is powerless if the attack is made ever so slightly on his flank. Perhaps the greatest disadvantage of this method is that it does not give the student the best kind of training. What he needs most in life is the ability to arrange and present ideas rapidly, not to speak a part by rote.

It would seem, then, that this plan should be advised only when the students are working for one formal debate, and are not preparing for a series of class or local contests that can all be controlled by the same instructor or critic. With beginners in oral argumentation this method will usually make the better showing, and may therefore be considered permissible in the case of those teams which, because of unfamiliarity with their opponents' methods, can take no chances. This plan of preparation is in no way harmful or dishonest, but lacks some of the more permanent advantages of the second method.

The second method of developing the brief into the forensic is by *oral composition*. This method demands that the debater shall *speak extemporaneously* from his *memorized brief*. This in no way means that careful preparation, deliberate thought, and precise organization are omitted. On the contrary, the formation of a brief from which a winning forensic can be expanded requires the most studious preparation, the keenest thought, and the most careful organization. Neither does it mean that, as soon as the brief is formed, the forensic can be presented. Before that step is taken, the debater who will be successful will spend much time, not in *written*, but in *oral* composition.

He will study his brief until he sees that it is not merely a succession of formal statements connected with "for's," but a series of ideas arranged in that form because they will, if presented in that order, bring conviction to his hearers. "Learning the brief," then, becomes not a case of memory, but a matter of seeing—seeing what comes next because that is the only thing that logically could come next. When the brief is in mind, the speaker will expand it into a forensic to an imaginary audience until he finds that he is expressing the ideas clearly, smoothly, and readily. Pay no attention to the fact that in the course of repeated deliveries the words will vary. Words make little difference if the framework of ideas is the same.

This method of composing the forensic trains the mind of the student to see the logical relationship of ideas, to acquire a command of language, and to vary the order of ideas if necessary. In doing these things, there are developed those qualities that are essential to all effective speaking.

A debater's success in giving unity and coherence to his argument depends chiefly on his method of introducing new ideas in supporting his issues. These changes from one idea to another, or transitions, as they are called, should always be made so that the hearer's attention will be recalled to the assertion which the new idea is intended to support. Suppose we have made this assertion: "Contests within schools are more desirable than contests between schools." We are planning to support this by proving: first, that the contests between schools are very much abused; second, that the proposed plan will be more democratic; and third, that the proposed plan will work well in practice. In supporting these issues, we should, of course, present a great deal of material. When we are ready to change from the first

supporting idea to the second, we must make that change in such a way that our hearers will know that we are planning to prove the second main point of our contention. But this is not enough. We must make that change so that they will be definitely reminded of what we have already proved. The same thing will hold true when we change to the third contention.

The following illustrates a faulty method of transition: Contests between schools are so abused that they should be abolished [followed by all the supporting material]. The proposed plan will be more democratic than the present [followed by its support]. The proposed plan would work well in practice [followed by its support]. No matter how thoroughly we might prove each of these, they would impress the audience as standing alone; they would show no coherence, no connection with one another. The following would be a better method: Contests within schools should be substituted for those between schools because contests between schools are open to abuses so great as to warrant their abolition [followed by its support]. We should then begin to prove the second issue in this way: But not only are contests between schools so open to abuse that they should be abolished, but they are less desirable than contests within schools for they are less democratic. [This will then be followed with the support of the second issue.] The transition to the third issue should be made in this way: Now, honorable judges, we have shown you that contests between schools are not worthy of continuance; we have shown you that the plan which we propose will be better in its democracy than the system at present in vogue; we now propose to complete our argument by showing you that our plan will work well in practice. [This would then be followed with the proper supporting material.]

Great speakers have shown that they realized the importance of these cementing transitions. Take for example Burke's argument that force will be an undesirable instrument to use against the colonies. He says: "First, permit me to observe that the use of force alone is but temporary." The next paragraph he begins: "My next objection is its uncertainty." He follows that with: "A further objection to force is that you impair the object by your very endeavor to preserve it." And he concludes: "Lastly, we have no sort of experience in favor of force as an instrument in the rule of our colonies." He used this principle to perhaps even greater advantage when he argued that "a



fierce spirit of liberty had grown up in the colonies." He supports this with claims which are introduced as follows:

"First, the people of the colonies are descendants of Englishmen."

"They were further confirmed in this pleasing error [their spirit of liberty] by the form of their provincial legislative assemblies."

"If anything were wanting to this necessary operation of the form of government, religion would have given it a complete effect."

"There is, in the South, a circumstance attending these colonies which, in my opinion, fully counterbalances this difference, and makes the spirit of liberty still more high and haughty than in those to the northward. It is that in Virginia and the Carolinas, they have a vast multitude of slaves."

"Permit me, Sir, to add another circumstance in our colonies, which contributes no mean part towards the growth and effect of this untractable spirit. I mean their education."

"The last cause of this disobedient spirit in the colonies is hardly less powerful than the rest as it is not merely moral, but laid deep in the natural constitution of things. Three thousand miles of ocean lie between you and them."

He finally summarizes these in this way, which further ties them together.

Then, Sir, from these six capital sources; of descent; of form of government; of religion in the northern provinces; of manners in the southern; of education; of the remoteness of situation from the first mover of government; from all these causes a fierce spirit of liberty has grown up.

In presenting the forensic to the judges and audience forget, so far as possible, that you are debating. You have a proposition in which you believe and which you want them to accept. Your purpose is not to make your hearers say: "How well he does it." You want them to say: "He is right."

Do not rant. Speak clearly, that you may be understood; and with enough force that you may be heard, but in the same manner that you use in conversation.

*Good gestures help.* *Good gestures* are those that come naturally in support of your ideas. While practicing alone notice what gestures you put in involuntarily. They are right. Do not ape anyone in gesture. Your oral work will be more effective without use of your hands than it will be with an ineffective use of them. The most ineffective use is the making of motions that are so violent or extravagant that they attract the listeners' attention to themselves and away from your ideas. Remember that the expression of your face is most important of all gestures.

Earnest interest, pleasantness, fairness and vigor expressed in the speaker's face at the right times have done more to win debates than other gestures have ever accomplished.

## 6. PRESENTING THE ARGUMENT

### *a. Influencing the Audience by Persuasion*

The aim of the debater is to win the audience over to his side of the question; to get them to think and feel as he does. By the logical presentation of his arguments, backed up by a well-chosen array of facts and statistics as proof, the debater appeals to the reason of his hearers, and if men were dominated by their reasoning powers alone, this would be sufficient. But men are subject also to their emotions which are the result of training, prejudice and environment. The debater therefore has a twofold task: he must appeal not only to the reason of his hearers but to their emotions also. In order to arouse them to action he must not only convince but he must also persuade.

Persuasion may be defined as an attempt to influence to action by appeal to the special interests of the hearer. As conviction appeals to the reason and is secured by logical argument, so persuasion must appeal to the emotions of the audience and is itself largely emotional. The debater must know what are the motives that sway mankind to action and how they are manifested. He must also study his audience to know its temper, prejudices and emotions, and how to sway them to gain his ends, and must himself be earnest and sincere in advocating what he believes.

There are a number of methods often employed to persuade the audience to the speaker's way of thinking. One may appeal to the highest and most unselfish motives such as the love of liberty, chivalry or desire for fair play; another appeal may be made to past experience, and the closer this experience comes to that of the audience, the more effective it will be. Another appeal may be made to the things every man holds dear, life itself, property rights, the right of free speech. A less justifiable appeal, although often a powerful one, is sometimes made to the prejudices and self-interest of the hearers. The debater should feel obligated at all times to appeal to the highest motives possible.

Persuasion is not only effected by a study of and an appeal to the emotions of the audience; it is effected by the attitude of the speaker himself. In order to plead effectively for a cause the speaker must believe in it himself and be able to speak for it with real feeling. William Trufant Foster states that the successful speaker must be genuinely sincere, dead in earnest, be simple and direct in his manner, bearing, tone of voice, and use of language, present his case with perfect fairness to both sides, be calm and self-controlled so that his emotions may seem the result of calm, vigorous thinking, keep his audience in good humor, be in sympathy with them and take them into his confidence.

The following suggestions for persuading the audience are given by Baker and Huntington:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) Ascertain the habits of mind of your proposed audience.
- (2) Determine the special interests and idiosyncrasies of your audience.
- (3) Connect lower with higher motives.
- (4) Remember that the larger the audience the higher the motives to which appeal may be made.
- (5) Startling an audience may rout indifference or effectively emphasize.
- (6) Let the nature of your task determine the order of your persuasion.
- (7) Unify the persuasion for some definite purpose.
- (8) Be flexible; adapt the work to unexpected exigencies.

#### *b. The Natural Procedure in Argument<sup>2</sup>*

In the study *Logic and Argumentation* (November 1924 issue of the JOURNAL) certain criticisms of argumentation were set down. Two points of attack on the traditional, in-a-line, debate brief type of argument were stressed: (1) a lack of realization of its actual thought basis and thus mechanical treatment of a thought process with much resultant inaccuracy, and (2) the possession by it of a monopolistic place where partnership of methods, evaluated juxtaposition of the old and certain new types of approach and reasoning, is the need. The lines of development advocated, of necessity very generally, were, then,

<sup>1</sup> *The Principles of Argumentation*. 1905. p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*. 11:319-37. November, 1925. *The Natural Procedure in Argument*. Gladys Graham.

internal reform of what we now have and the addition of new features.

Leaving the internal reform aside for the time being, it is in relation to that second phase and need that the present study has been made. It seeks to treat, as fully as limited space will allow, what might be called a new type of argument,<sup>1</sup> one as yet undeveloped on its scientific side as far as argumentation is concerned. The logician who gave its principles to the philosophical world in their most complete form<sup>2</sup> has called it "the natural procedure in argument." For the sake of clarity treatment of it here will be in relation to (1) general nature of method of development, (2) values, (3) underlying principles and technique, construction and tests for validity.

A certain critic, reviewing a modern play, heads his paragraph "The Triumph of the Inevitable" and writes:

"The director does not seem to tell the story. He seems to follow respectfully in the path of its unfolding. It is as simple and direct and compelling as life itself. It has the inevitable progress of the old Greek drama."

Change the first sentence a little to read: "The speaker does not seem to force the argument," then go on, "He seems to follow in the path of its unfolding. It is . . . direct and *compelling*. It has . . . *inevitable* progress." Reading thus one gets something, much indeed, of the general method of what we call the *systematic argument* and of the end which it desires. Its plan is simply to portray a situation which gradually, of itself, without

<sup>1</sup> The claim of newness is here made with fingers crossed, as it were! For it, for the time being, "King's X" is asked. It happens that since the "new" or "alternate" method of argument and reasoning under consideration was first suggested, valuable and highly valued discussion and criticism have come from Mr. Wichelns in his article "Analysis and Synthesis in Argumentation" and from Mr. Immer in conversation. By both the important question of newness, of whether or not argumentation does have, in another form, the thing being suggested, has been raised. That question must be met and seriously considered—it brings directly to the fore interesting and vital matters concerning a present lacuna in the science of argument—but it has seemed best to defer such consideration until after the straight presentation of the "natural procedure" argument on its own merits. In short, the desire is to first present, as clearly as is possible in a necessarily brief discussion, the constructive case, then to take a moment or two at the end to consider it in relation to the questions raised. Certainly this "new" type of argument is somehow related to what Mr. Wichelns has termed "the rhetorical plan of a speech" (this JOURNAL, JUNE, 1925, p. 268); it may come close in certain phases of its practice to the kind of argument Mr. Stone and many others have advocated, for which the brief is not a guide, though still retained as a preliminary test of the student's own thinking (this JOURNAL, Vol. IV, p. 269).

<sup>2</sup> It is in the work of the late Bernard Bosanquet that the basic principles underlying the natural procedure in argument are to be found . . .

compulsion or contention on the part of the speaker, through the compelling power of a developing situation makes evident to the mind of the hearer the necessity of one certain solution. The method is not in the orthodox and generally accepted sense argumentative; rather it is that of exposition with a goodly dash of narration and description. Technically it does not argue; it merely sets forth—yet slowly, definitely as it proceeds, the lines of descriptive development begin to converge and it becomes compellingly evident to each thinking mind that such a set of conditions implies, necessitates, one thing, the conclusion toward which an approach has been, from the beginning, being made. It is argument in a very true sense, its aim is to convince and persuade, yet it is argument of which exposition, narration and description are handmaidens.

To briefly illustrate movement and general method, first as seen in a powerful piece of argument which of necessity worked from background: Probably the most noted British authority on Russia was to speak to an American audience concerning the Russian revolution at a time when the stir over the vicious character of Bolshevism carried with it the belief that the revolution was simply a precipitate and unwarranted uprising of a vicious lower class and a thing for which that lower class was wholly responsible. The speaker wished to prove that such was in no way the case. His proposition to be established was, baldly put, "The revolutionary group in Russia was not responsible for the revolution. The upper classes, not the revolting lower class, were the real causal factors." Given his desire and the state of mind of the audience, what was his method of development to be? By no means that prescribed by brief structure, statement of proposition, the enumeration of the contentions and antagonizing points to be established and their subsequent superimposed proof. Instead he began far away from the revolution with a selective, rapidly moving story-picture—Russia with its physical conditions, the nature of its people, its crushing autocracy, its oppressions; Russia in the war and the unnecessary slaughter, the crippled rising from the field of the dead and going back to say that they had gone up like sheep, unarmed, a mass of humanity hurled against machine guns. It was not emotionally done; it was simply fact piled upon fact, picture put up beside picture, until the very pressure of it demanded the conclusion.

*The situation being what it was, one thing must come.* The speaker's conclusion, which at the beginning would have been foreign to the audience, hostilely received, was at the close but the result of its own thinking. It fairly rushed ahead of him to it. Because it had accepted the non-contentious background situation, it must accept the conclusion which that situation implied. According to formal designation the work was not argument—and yet how powerfully the speaker had argued and won his point.

In a most unusual debate on the League of Nations the same type of development was used by a speaker upholding the League and addressing an audience realized to be hostile. With a consciousness and command of his method, he turned the thought of the group, not initially to the League at all, but to a factual and descriptive portrayal of world conditions at the time; the economic, the financial, the psychological, the military situation were simply shown. The audience was interested, it thought with the speaker. And gradually the lines of development converged; that seen situation required a definite thing and, having accepted the situation, the mind could not consistently refuse the move implied.

So much for the moment for briefly noted illustrations given simply to make initially clear the lines of general development. Consider now, in relation to those noted lines of development, the concrete statement of method given by Bosanquet as he treats a type of argument which finds its basis in *implication*, in reasoning from a given situation to its necessitated, its implied part. He writes:

"When a barrister opens his case, or a theorist introduces us, in his initial statement, to the basis of his doctrine . . . an exposition is set before us which at first sight reads more like a description than an argument and it is only as we enter further into the proposed construction that we observe it to be in fact the development of a subject *intended to introduce us to a scheme of consequences which, if we accept the initial description, we shall be unable to deny.*"<sup>1</sup>

Such is, according to Bosanquet, the natural procedure in argument, the natural method of opening a case. It is certainly the one used in the instance noted above. Yet it stands as a definite departure from strict argument technique as set down in the texts of the profession; it differs widely from the linear inference method of development found in the brief. It is necessary,

<sup>1</sup> Bosanquet, B. *Implication and Linear Inference*, p. 105. Italics are the author's.

then, to ask, before we pass to the rather difficult but keenly interesting matter of basic principles and technique, just what are its outstanding values.

Probably the first of such values arises from the fact that the method approaches conviction by means of a psychologically well-grounded, ounce-of-prevention type of persuasion. It is a mere platitude that a man cannot be forced to a desired response. Convinced against his will he remains "of the same opinion still" today as when the maxim was first stated. This is realized, but combined with the fact that there is in human nature in general a very distinct tendency toward what one psychologist has well called "the contrarient idea," that is, a contrary reaction directly against baldly controversial argument superimposed, and you have the distinct problem which argument must face. It is our task here merely to note that the systematic argument solves that problem by super-imposing no controversial points at all. And such is in reality the normal procedure, in a search for truth, is it not? The speaker has reached his conclusion through a noting and evaluation of fact; he has probably come to it as a development out of a situation observed. Perhaps he himself would have reacted adversely to it had it been dropped upon him without preliminary study—out of the blue. His plan, then, might well be to direct the mind of the audience along the course which he has followed so that, through noting certain of the facts which have led him to his conclusion, it may *through its own thinking* arrive at the same end. Its task will of course have been greatly facilitated by his work. He has gone through a mass of irrelevant material and material superfluous though relevant. All that he has cut away in preliminary work and in relation to certain definite and concrete standards; now he can set before the audience the clear view of the situation. He is not forcing, contending, compelling; he is directing the mind that it may form its own conclusion, make its own inferences, to which it is compelled only by the logic of observed facts. There is left no place for the contrarient idea; the conclusion is only reached when the mind of the audience is prepared for it by its own thinking just as the mind of the speaker may be assumed to have been.

Consider for a moment the value of such an approach for the work on the Russian revolution previously noted. It was a highly exaggerated case of the probability of the contrariant idea. The audience was frankly hostile. Had the speaker thrown down at the outset the gage of battle of his conclusion along with a list of definitely controversial points to be established, had he done it even after a pleasing detachable introduction or "History of the Question," an almost impenetrable wall of contrary belief would have arisen between him and his audience. It would have listened politely with its ears but its mind would have given back only unbelief based on prejudice and preconceived opinion. Yet with a different type of reasoning the speaker convinced his audience; he won as I have rarely seen a man win against odds.

The same situation faced the speaker on the League to whose work reference was made. A case of very great likelihood of the contrariant idea—the problem solved by directing the thought of the audience through fact to conclusion, by a natural rather than a forced procedure. It is this psychological normalcy of its approach to conviction which gives to the systematic argument much of its outstanding power. Because of this it is peculiarly adapted for use with a hostile audience. Its object is constantly conviction, its method of approach persuasive in the best sense of the term . . .

### *c. Delivery of the Debate<sup>1</sup>*

NECESSITY FOR GOOD DELIVERY.—Good delivery is essential to the best debating. Audiences and judges are so constituted that the manner in which a thing is said largely determines their attitude toward the thought of what is said. The most commonplace utterances of a speaker who possesses an effective delivery often produce a profound impression. An almost perfect speech from the literary standpoint frequently falls flat because of its weak presentation.

DELIVERY OF THE MEMORIZED SPEECH.—The debater, and especially the high school debater, is apt to fall into very bad habits of delivery, due to the fact that he usually memorizes his debates. The practice of writing entire speeches and memorizing them word for word almost always results in a mechanical, monotonous delivery. In presenting the memorized speech which has

<sup>1</sup> Jones, L. *Manual for Debaters*. p. 66-9. Univ. of Wash. 1913.



been rehearsed and rehearsed until not a word is misplaced, the debater rarely thinks about what he is saying; he doesn't need to think about it; the speech which he has learned has become like a phonographic record, and all that the debater has to do is to start the machinery of his voice and the speech will be automatically produced. And the delivery of a debate in this manner is often about as effective as a good phonograph reproduction. It is a well recognized fact that in order to convey ideas to an audience it is necessary for the speaker to hold the thought of his speech before him as he speaks, and this is very difficult to do if the speech can be produced without any mental effort except the act of memory. Also, the delivery of the memorized speech is apt to be too rapid. The debater speaks without deliberation when it is no effort to select the language which he uses, and the pauses which he does make are apt to be studied and dramatic rather than natural. The cure for these faults of delivery is the cultivation of the extemporaneous method of speaking. In adopting this plan of debating the student will doubtless flounder about helplessly for a time, but with hard work and practice he will ultimately develop powers of delivery far excelling those of the debater who speaks from memory. Notes may be used at first but these should be abandoned as the debater gains more confidence and ability in speaking.

**COMMON FAULTS IN DELIVERY.**—Another fault in delivery common to many debaters is their violent, noisy style of presenting their debates. They forget that mere loud talking is not debating, and that the most effective speaker is the one who presents his arguments with the least waste of physical energy. The debater should never let himself out to the full limit of his powers—he should always have power in reserve. To control his audience the speaker must first control himself.

Many debaters begin their speeches with a louder tone and more energy than they use in closing them, and the effect produced is an anti-climax. It is a most ridiculous spectacle to see a debater tear a passion to tatters in the first part of his speech and grow gradually weaker and weaker as he approaches the close of his address. The delivery of the speaker in opening his debate should be quiet and dignified. As the speech progresses the vigor which he puts into his words should naturally increase. Different parts of each argument call for differences in tone, volume and emphasis. The transitions from one argument to the next should

be indicated in the delivery by appropriate pauses, changes in position on the platform, and by proper modulations of the voice. Yet these changes in delivery should be so entirely natural that the speaker unconsciously makes them.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR DELIVERY.**—The debater should use the natural conversational tone throughout his debate, merely elevating the tone as the size of the room and the audience demands. The enunciation of every word should be clear-cut and distinct. The rate of speaking should always be slow enough to permit the speaker to give proper emphasis to his words, and to enable the audience to grasp his thought. It is better to be too deliberate than too hasty. The speaker's position and gestures should be such that the attention of the audience is not detracted from what he is saying. If gestures are made, they should be entirely spontaneous. The debater's problem is the same as that of any public speaker. He wishes to produce in the minds of the audience the convictions and emotions of his own mind, and his effort should be to make his voice and his body express as perfectly as possible the content of his mind.

It is in the delivery of the debate that the debater's powers of persuasion come into use. The attitude of the debater toward the audience should be that of sincerity and earnestness. He should believe what he says as completely as possible during the debate. In presenting his case he should be simple and unaffected. The words which he uses should be the simplest words available for the expression of the thought of his speech. He should avoid all forms of grandiloquence and rhetorical or dramatic display. He should be fair, generous and courteous in his treatment of the members of the opposing team and their arguments. Ridicule and sarcasm, if employed at all, should be used discreetly, and should be directed against the argument of the opponents and not against their personalities. Above all, the debater should be a thorough gentleman in his treatment of the opposing team and in his attitude toward the audience.

**TRAINING IN DELIVERY.**—Every debater should, if possible, take courses in oral expression and public speaking under a competent instructor. In this work he will be given exercises which will help him to develop a graceful and easy position on the platform, a voice which is agreeable and expressive, correct inflection, pause and pitch. If no such courses are available, the

debater should study and practice without an instructor from some standard text on public speaking.

The study of the theory of delivery is of no particular value unless the debater has a great deal of actual practice in speaking. To develop a good delivery it is necessary to learn by experience the most effective way of presenting an argument to an audience. Edward Everett Hale once said: "If you want to be a good public speaker, whenever anyone is fool enough to ask you to speak, you be fool enough to do it." Constant practice and careful observation of faults and effort to correct them will enable any person with ordinary natural ability to develop a clear, effective delivery.

#### *d. Facing the Audience*<sup>1</sup>

The effective public speaker receives from his audience in vapor, what he pours back on them in a flood.—GLADSTONE.

Public speakers of long experience have said that they never face an audience without undergoing that painful discomposure called stage fright.

#### JUST BEFORE SPEAKING

is a critical moment. Scores of methods for inducing repose of mind and body have been suggested, but . . . only one word of advice will be attempted: *Maintain your confidence.* If you have made faithful, intelligent preparation, you know more of your phase of the subject than any one in your audience is likely to know. If you are speaking from a sense of duty, go forward as to a duty. If you have committed all or part of the address to memory (and committing to memory means handing a thing over to the memory), you must not bear the burden too heavily upon your spirit. Be confident by a supreme effort of the will. Be confident because of reliance upon preparatory effort, upon the teaching of experience, upon the good sense of your audience, upon your ability to hold yourself in hand. This is not advising presumption. Far from it. It is simply urging the importance of asserting your nerve as determinedly before speaking as you would before going to the dentist. No better advice than the foregoing could apply also to

#### THE FIRST MOMENTS OF DELIVERY

An audience yields everything to a firm and confident speaker. Even when you are quaking in your boots with the ague of fear,

<sup>1</sup> Esenwein, J. B. *How to Attract and Hold an Audience.* p. 154-9. Hinds, Noble & Eldredge. 1902.

and your teeth fain would beat "retreat," you must assume a boldness you do not feel. For doing this there is nothing like deep, steady breathing, a firm look at the dreaded audience, and—if you are not caught at it—a clenched fist. But do not fear your auditors. They want you to succeed, and always honor an exhibition of pluck. They are fair, and know that you are only one man against a thousand. In these climes audiences do not eat the *pre-prandial* orator after hearing his discourse. Besides, if you are half so bad as at that moment you feel yourself to be, you are not good enough to eat. Look at your audience, squarely, earnestly, expressively. Why do so many men denounce big hats if they do not wish to catch the eloquent gleam of the orator's eye? The habit of looking at the walls or the ceiling during delivery robs the orator of much of his power. Mirabeau used to transfix his auditors by the intensity of his gaze, and though he crossed their dearest purposes, they dared not lift a finger in opposition to the flood of his eloquence.

Will to be self-controlled if you cannot be calm. The audience is not whirling madly in a circle, there are only the usual number of lights, the rostrum is not heaving, Niagara is not roaring beside you. *No! Put these phantasms down by will-power.* No one who has not experienced it can imagine the terrors of stage fright; but no one who has not cultivated it can understand the power of the human will.

A firm grip upon the opening words is necessary, so that you could repeat them even if the roof should collapse. Begin at a moderate pitch, in a moderate tone, and do not let yourself get too fiery in the introduction. You will need some of that fire in five minutes. This much of Dr. Leifchild's rule is good:—

Begin low,  
Go on slow;  
Rise higher,  
And take fire.

It is related of the second Henry Grattan that he "could not utter a half-dozen sentences without getting into such a passion and indulging in such violence of gesture that it was quite unsafe for any member to sit within reach of his right arm."

#### THE COURSE OF DELIVERY

Excess of feeling at the outstart must be checked, not choked. It is just as offensive for a speaker to go to sleep on his feet, as

for him to rant. Indeed, ranting is the lesser of the two evils. The same vital power of will which keeps emotion within bounds will serve to call it forth when needed. It is not necessary to argue the psychological question of whether emotion can be made, nor is it needful to study the actor's tricks in simulating emotion; it is sufficient to know that you *can* arouse yourself from torpor on the platform, that you *can* get into sympathy with your theme, that you *can* make yourself feel anything on which you think intently enough, from a creeping chill to hot indignation. Just now, while you are reading, you can taste the sour of acid on the tip of your tongue, feel an itching on your left shoulder-blade, or a tickling in your throat—if you will to do so.

This excitation of the emotions for oratorical purposes may be cultivated. Artificiality! sneers some one. Trickery! complains another. "Stale indignation, and fervor a week old!" laughs Sidney Smith. All wrong. It is physical earnestness. It is a legitimate calling upon the body to be what it was created to be: the instrument of the soul, responsive to its moods and tenses. "He who reigns within himself and rules his passions, desires, and fears, is more than a king."<sup>1</sup> He is an orator. You would not think of condoling with a bereaved friend in a harsh, unfeeling tone. Even if you had a headache or were preoccupied, you would command the delicately sympathetic word and tone. This is not hypocrisy, it is common decency. And so in public speech you must be so responsive to your thought that emotion will arise when needed. Take your message to heart—you can if you have prepared with sincerity and conviction. Make the cause for emotion in your discourse a personal cause, and it will call forth your own emotions.

Never think for a moment that effective oratory can be an accident. Certainly the inspiration of delivery will often carry the orator beyond himself, and give his discourse a sweep and power as unpremeditated as it is convincing. But just as certainly such eloquence could not be attained had the orator failed to call into play—notice, *call* into play—all his powers of body, mind and spirit. Holyoke relates of Shiel, the little Irish orator, that when he replied in the House of Commons to the Duke of Wellington, who had said that the Irish were aliens in race, blood and religion, "his accents were in his hair, his eyes, in his arms, in every limb. He was alive all over, and from this

<sup>1</sup> Milton.

confluence of action proceeded a piercing stream of sentences of scorn and fire."<sup>1</sup>

The annals of oratory abound in instances of great speakers who made the most of their physical endowment, and of many who, by sheer force of determination, won in spite of the handicap of diminutive body, squeaking voice, lisping tongue or sluggish blood.

How do you clench your hand for a fist gesture—so weakly that it would not hurt a child? Or do you throw your whole muscular organization into that clenched fist? How do you set your teeth in speaking of determination? Does your eye fade or flash when you press home your point? Does your voice ring or falter in direct appeal? Naturalness, ease, dignity, variety, elasticity, quickness—these are the expressions of a body vitalized and made responsive to the inner man.

What is true of physical earnestness is true of manner in delivery. Does the thought require the familiarity of colloquial expression, the directness of appeal, the dignity of elevated mood or the fervor of passion? Then rely upon the will in delivery. Are you, like Sir Henry Irving and uncounted others, the victim of offensive mannerisms? Simply stop them by thinking and willing. Do not lose the kind offices of so good a friend as your will by lack of acquaintance with its power to do you good.

## 7. COOPERATION AMONG DEBATERS

### a. *Conferences Among Debaters*<sup>2</sup>

It is a great advantage for opponents in a debate to get together once or twice after they have thoroughly investigated the question, and when they are ready to organize their arguments. In this conference, the debaters ought to come to a definite understanding as to what they regard as the *main issues* in the debate, and what will be the order of these issues. This will help to bring about a clash on the main propositions in dispute, and will fix attention on essentials.

Debaters frequently dislike the idea of these conferences, feeling that they "give away" their case. This, however, proceeds from a wrong conception of debating. The aim of a debate is

<sup>1</sup> "Public Speaking and Debate," p. 245.

<sup>2</sup> Gialason, H. B. *Effective Debating*, p. 36. Univ. of Minn. 1914.

to discover truth and help the audience to come to a conclusion on the question. It is not mere *disputation*, with the idea of getting the other fellow into a hole. Moreover, agreeing on the main issues does not give away the evidence that will be used in supporting them. Admitting that it is laudable to win, we may say that debates are not won by using unexpected arguments and laying traps for opponents. They are won by carefully choosing the main propositions to be supported, by wisely choosing evidence in support of them, and by effectively presenting the arguments to the hearers.

### *b. Division of Work Among Speakers<sup>1</sup>*

If, as is frequently the case, there are four leaders, the work may be divided in this way:

1. The first speaker on the affirmative gives the outline of the entire affirmative case, shows what he and his associates are to prove, and presents his own arguments. Incidentally he may do something to destroy the force of arguments which may be brought forward by the other side.

2. The first speaker on the negative comes next. He shows what he and his colleagues are to prove, and presents his part of the proof. He has the advantage of knowing what has been said by the opening speaker, and does what he can to weaken those arguments. He may, if he sees fit, anticipate some of the points likely to be made by the second speaker on the affirmative.

3. The second affirmative speaker does the work outlined by his colleague and answers the first negative speaker. He then attacks arguments that may be made by the second speaker on the negative and sums up the case for the affirmative.

4. The second negative speaker finishes the defensive work begun by his colleague and does his best to refute the arguments of the affirmative. He then sums up the case for the negative. . . .

After the closing of the general debate, one representative from each side is entitled to make a final rebuttal speech. In these rebuttal speeches no new arguments or evidence can be introduced except for the purpose of answering an opponent or of making clearer and more emphatic some argument already

<sup>1</sup> Genung and Hanson. *Outlines of Composition and Rhetoric*. p. 351-2. Ginn & Co. 1915.

advanced by the speaker's side. The representative of the affirmative comes last. As the burden of proof rests upon his side, he should have the last word. The closing speakers need to be especially clever in singling out the main points that have been proved, and in sending them home to the audience in a clear, concise, emphatic summary.

(It often happens that there are three speakers on each side and each debater is allowed to speak in rebuttal. When this is the case, the work will have to be more fully divided so as to give each debater his share, but the principles of division and the general order of the argument hold good as stated above.—COMP.)

#### I. WORK OF THE FIRST AFFIRMATIVE AND NEGATIVE SPEAKERS<sup>1</sup>

It may be well also to point out more clearly the somewhat special nature of the first speeches on each side. The first speech of the affirmative must, of course, make clear to the judges and the audience what you wish them to believe. This will involve all the steps which have already been pointed out as necessary to accomplish that result. The first speaker can gain a great deal for his side by presenting this material not only with great clearness, but in a manner which will win the goodwill of the audience toward himself, his team, and his side of the subject. To do this, he must be genial, honest, modest, and fair. He must make his hearers feel that he is not giving a narrow or prejudiced analysis of the question; he must make them feel that his treatment is open and fair to both sides, and that he finally reaches the issues not at all because he *wishes* to find those issues, but because a thorough analysis of the question will allow him to reach no others.

The first speaker on the negative side may have much the same work to do. If, however, he agrees with what the first speaker of the affirmative has said, he will save time merely by stating that fact and by summarizing in a sentence or two the steps leading to the issues. If he does not agree with the interpretation which the affirmative has given to the question, it will be necessary for him to interpret the question himself. He must make clear to the judges why his analysis is correct and that of his opponent faulty.

<sup>1</sup> Lyon, L. S. *Elements of Debating*. p. 55-6. Univ. of Chicago Press. 1913.



## 8. REBUTTAL

*a. Speeches in Rebuttal*<sup>1</sup>

In an argument to the jury, the counsel is limited to facts brought out in the evidence. He may use any material as long as it is for the purpose of argument or illustration, but when he presents his case he cannot go beyond the evidence already introduced. The same rule of law or of ethics (for it is both) should apply to rebuttal speeches in general argument and debate. A rebuttal speech should be honestly confined to arguments already set forth. To introduce into a final speech in rebuttal new material that has been carefully reserved for the purpose is dishonest. Judges of debate will usually disregard new arguments thus introduced, and sometimes will discount the standing of debaters who violate the rule.

*b. Suggestions for the Rebuttal Speaker in Debate*<sup>2</sup>

Rebuttal speakers in debate should do two things: They should refute the principal arguments of the opposition, and they should sum up the case for their own side.

## THE PLAN OF THE REBUTTAL SPEECH

The plan of the rebuttal will depend somewhat on whether there is a one-man, two-man, or three-man rebuttal. In a one-man rebuttal, the one chosen has the whole responsibility on his own hands for the successful refutation of his opponent's points and the summing up of his own and his colleagues' arguments. He should decide which points he should concentrate his efforts upon and then formulate a clear plan for his refutation and a place for his summary.

But when there are two or three rebuttal speakers, it is desirable to decide long before the debate takes place just what part of the opponents' arguments each shall cover. The whole case of the opposition must be gone over with a view to determining what will be its probable issues. There can then be a division of those probable issues between the rebuttal speakers so that each one will be responsible for the gathering of certain

<sup>1</sup> Denny, Duncan and McKinney. *Argumentation and Debate*. p. 115. Am. Book Co. 1910.

<sup>2</sup> Contributed by Clarence S. Dike, Atlantic City (N. J.) High School.

material. Cards, 5 in. x 3 in., are good to use for this purpose, one argument on a card. A caption should be put at the top designating what it is about; and the author's name should be at the bottom with the page of the book or magazine where it is found.

If two men have rebuttal speeches for a three man debate, it is often desirable for the first rebuttal speaker to cover the first two presentation speeches of the opposition and the second rebuttal speaker to cover the last presentation speech and the rebuttal speeches of the opposition.

In a three-man rebuttal the first speaker may be responsible for the first two presentation speeches; the second may cover the third presentation speech, and the third may cover the rebuttal speeches of the opposition and sum up the arguments for his side.

It is desirable to give the best debater the last rebuttal speech, and he should be given little specifically to cover, other than to make the summary for the side. There are always certain things to be emphasized and many points to be covered that were overlooked by the others. The third rebuttal speaker can handle all these things. If the second rebuttal speaker can undertake more than the third presentation speech of his opponents, he can do something toward relieving the burden from the third speaker by covering the rebuttal speeches of the opposition or refuting some points not handled by his colleague, the first rebuttal speaker.

What is to be the plan of the rebuttal speeches? One thing it should not be, and that is a formless, incoherent refutation of incidental points. What do you think of Plan A? Plan B?

#### PLAN A

- I. Introduction (Planned beforehand)
- II. Attack opponents' arguments
  - A. First issue
  - B. Second issue
  - C. Third issue
- III. Summary of attack
- IV. Contrast of affirmative and negative argument with summary of your own.
- V. Concluding paragraph (Thought out beforehand)

## PLAN B

- I. Introductory paragraph (Thought out beforehand)
- II. Attack opponents' argument
  - A. Issues not the right ones
  - B. Flaw in cause and effect relationship
  - C. Inconsistent
  - D. Spend time on arguments you admit
  - E. Other fallacies
- III. Attack opponents' evidence
  - A. Where did he get his facts?
  - B. Witnesses are not authorities
  - C. Evidence inconsistent
  - D. Many unsupported assertions
  - E. Evidence inaccurate, insufficient, or irrelevant
- IV. Summary of attack
  - V. Contrast affirmative and negative argument with a summary of your own.
- VI. Concluding paragraph (Thought out beforehand)

These two plans are suggestive of what may be done. Plan A deals with the issues; Plan B emphasizes the argument and the evidence. The two types of rebuttal speeches can be used together, making a still better plan as follows:

## PLAN C

- I. Introductory Paragraph (Thought out beforehand)
- II. Attack opponents' argument as a whole
  - A. Criticize choice of issues
  - B. They have asserted but not proved
  - C. They have spent time on matter that you admit
  - D. Anything else that has to do with the whole argument. See "Some things to hit first and hit hard" listed below.
- III. Attack opponents' argument issue by issue
  - A. First issue
    1. Evidence faulty in some way
    2. Inference faulty
      - a. Cause and effect flaw
      - b. Inconsistent
      - c. Other fallacies

- B. Second issue
  - 1. Evidence faulty
  - 2. Inference faulty
- C. Third issue
  - 1. Evidence faulty
  - 2. Inference faulty
- IV. Summary of this attack
- V. Contrast of affirmative and negative arguments with summary of your own points, showing as you go along that your arguments are not subject to the same criticism that your opponents' are.
- VI. Concluding paragraph (Thought out beforehand)

Although Plan C is the best, it must not be set up as an idol and worshipped. Each occasion presents its own problems and its own matters of emphasis. It is desirable sometimes to omit the well-planned introductory paragraph and satisfy the audience immediately with the refutation of a threatening issue. Let first things come *first* irrespective of the standard plan. Make your own plan according to the demands of the occasion.

#### OF FIRST IMPORTANCE

Never show discourtesy, sarcasm, unfairness, or lose your temper. Be fair and gentlemanly. When stating the argument of an opponent for the purpose of refuting it, state it exactly as he said it or in the spirit in which it was said. Don't belittle it or make it seem less than it is. But having stated it, refute it vigorously.

Hit the important thing first in rebuttal. Your audience expects you to do this. Don't hesitate to use plenty of time on that which needs emphasis. A good shot in the heart of a deer will dispatch the animal; you do not have to break every bone in his body.

No new *arguments* may be advanced in rebuttal; but new *evidence* to refute your opponents or to bolster up your own arguments is perfectly permissible. New *reasons* for the truth or falsity of the proposition or any part of it are not allowed.

Always make clear to your audience just what you are doing, especially as to which issue of your opponents you are attack-

ing. Indicate, too, that you are refuting and not bolstering up your own case, by saying, "In answer to the contention of my opponents that," etc., or "My opponent, the second speaker of the affirmative, said," etc.

Never refute anything in rebuttal that your opponents have not actually brought up. If you are the first rebuttal speaker, however, or if your opponents have the last rebuttal speech, and you expect to be given a deep thrust from your opponent unless you anticipate it, you may tell your audience that you expect your opponent to argue thus and so, and that they should be warned, etc.

The two essentials of a good rebuttal speaker are keen thinking and thorough knowledge of both sides of the question. Keen thinking is more or less of an inherent trait, but knowledge of both sides of the question can be acquired. Evidence on both sides should be listed on cards and classified in such a way as to be usable at a moment's notice.

If you do not know by heart the evidence you wish to cite, you may read it; but read it well, and only as much of it as is relevant; and do not lose the eyes of the audience for very long at a time.

#### SOME THINGS TO HIT FIRST AND HIT HARD

1. Your opponent generally makes unsupported assertions. Use plenty of time to show that this is so.
2. Your opponents use an issue that really proves your side instead of theirs.
3. Your opponents have not analyzed the question carefully.
4. Your opponents use as evidence facts which need supporting evidence to establish their truth.
5. Your opponents have been inconsistent in a big way.
6. You can crowd your opponents into a dilemma.
7. Your opponents have spent a great deal of time on matters that you admit.
8. Your opponents in proving their side by the method of residues (process of elimination) have made an improper enumeration of the methods. Show that there are other methods not mentioned by your opponents. This leaves the audience in doubt as to the merit of the methods not covered.

## QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ISSUES

1. Are your opponents' issues vital ones? If not, prove that they are not, and that yours are more important.
2. Are your opponents' issues correct as to the analysis of the question?
3. Have you blocked at least one issue? Have you blocked more than one? Recount to your audience how such issues have been refuted. Make clear, if you are on the negative that the burden of proof is on the affirmative, and that the affirmative case must stand on the proof of *all* the issues (if this is so).
4. Have your opponents resorted to a hit or miss jumble of arguments, bringing out no clear-cut issues? If so, modestly call the attention of the audience to the fact, and state what their issues should be.

## QUESTIONS ABOUT THE EVIDENCE

1. Has the evidence of your opponents been in the nature of facts or testimony or both?
2. If their evidence has been largely facts, where did they get the facts?
3. Are the facts doubtful, inaccurate, insufficient, or irrelevant?
4. Are any two facts inconsistent with each other, or is any fact inconsistent with known conditions?
5. If the facts are statistics, ask yourself the following:
  - a. Do the figures come from good authority?
  - b. Are they taken from an abnormal period of time?
  - c. Is the period of time long enough to make the figures fair?
  - d. Do you have different statistics which come from as good or better source covering the matter in question?
6. If the evidence of your opponents has been largely testimony, the following questions should be asked:
  - a. Is the testimony of the different witnesses consistent?
  - b. Is the witness qualified to testify?
    1. Is he prejudiced?
    2. Is he informed on the subject?
    3. Is he a man whose judgment in this matter is reliable?

- c. Is the opinion of an authority or expert needed to prove any one of the issues? Does the issue involve things of such technical nature that a specialist is needed to tell what is what? If not, one man's opinion may be as good as another's, and your witnesses will cancel the witnesses of your opponents. How then can the matter be settled? Show them.

### QUESTIONS OF INFERENCE OR ARGUMENT

1. Is the connection between the cause and effect complete?  
Example: The opposition states that there were so many strikes in 1921 as a reason why labor unions are a detriment to the public, but fails to show that the labor unions were a cause of those strikes. The refutation here is to show that many of the strikes were not caused by labor unions.
2. Is the cause sufficient to produce the effect?
3. Might something interfere with the normal cause and effect relation?
4. Could any other cause have produced the effect?
5. In a generalization, are the specific examples cited fair specimens?
6. In a generalization, are there enough examples?
7. In an analogy, are the two things compared alike in essential particulars?
  - a. Because compulsory arbitration of labor disputes works well in New Zealand is no proof that it will work well in the United States. Show that the two countries are unlike in every way that you can.

### FINAL SUGGESTION

You cannot do everything suggested in this outline. It would be undesirable to do so. You should, however, understand it thoroughly, and let your judgment and the occasion determine what parts of it you shall use in any instance.

## PART II

### DEBATING SOCIETIES: ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

#### I. DIRECTIONS FOR ORGANIZING<sup>1</sup>

The debating society should play an important part in our educational system. Such men as Macaulay, Scott and Stevenson have testified to the value of literary and debating societies in their education; and there is no reason why, at the present day, a debating society should not occupy an equally important place in training people to think on public questions and to discuss them.

Of itself, the debating society furnishes valuable training and experience. For one thing, the members benefit because of the practice that it gives in parliamentary procedure. This, of course, should promote precision, accuracy and orderliness. It should stimulate ingenuity in applying set principles and rules in a practical way. The knowledge of parliamentary law that is gained in a debating society may well be of value in the activities of after life.

As the background for more formal debates, the society is also of value. In the first place, from its membership it furnishes the debaters. It also furnishes the occasion and the audience. The presence of the debating society gives opportunity for engaging in debating in many forms. Impromptu discussions may be held. Extemporaneous debates may be conducted (the extemporaneous debate differs from the impromptu discussion, in that the general subject to be talked upon is thoroughly studied by the speakers, but the specific phase of the question is announced a few minutes before the discussion takes place.) Formal debates may be held in which two or three speakers present the affirmative and negative of the question and rebuttal objections are given

<sup>1</sup> Drury, Newton B. *How to Organize and Conduct a Debating Society. In California University. Debating and Debating Societies.* p. 11-12.



according to fixed rules. Moreover, lectures and program discussions may take place and even mock trials may be engaged in if the members of the society have a legal bent.

In the organization of a debating society, there are two main steps: (1) The preliminary organization, and (2) the permanent organization.

Before the meeting at which the preliminary organization takes place is held, the field should be well canvassed. It should be determined just how much interest in the proposed debating society exists in the school or organization in question. Those who are interested should be urged to attend the first meeting in order that the project may be started with spirit. The time and place of the first meeting should be well advertised. A person who is interested and who is capable of presenting the plans of the society forcibly and with enthusiasm should be selected to preside as temporary chairman. It is necessary, also, to have certain people with ideas ready to lead the discussion as to the future plans of the society.

When the meeting has been called to order by the temporary chairman, a motion should be put and carried for the appointment of a constitution committee, and another for the appointment of a nominating committee. After a few speeches on the plans of the society, the meeting may then adjourn, to meet at an early date specified in the motion.

The constitution committee should consist of from three to five members and should meet and draw up a constitution to be presented to the society at its next meeting.

The nominating committee should prepare a list of the names to propose as candidates for president, vice president, secretary, and the other officers provided for in the constitution.

The second meeting, for the purpose of permanent organization, should take place shortly after the preliminary organization. At this time the temporary chairman should call for the report of the committee on the constitution and, article by article, the constitution should be read and discussed and voted upon. Then a vote should be taken upon the constitution in its final revised form as a whole. Next, election should be held of the various officers provided for in the constitution, according to the method laid down. After the permanent president of the society is elected, he should take the chair and conduct the election of the remaining officers. The standing committees provided for in the consti-

tution may be appointed by the president then and there, or he may announce an intention to appoint them at the next meeting. The same action may be taken in regard to any special committees for which there is demand. At this meeting plans for the future activities of the society should be discussed and, if possible, some definite program should be arranged for the third meeting.

Certain suggestions may be made at this point in regard to the conducting of the debating society.

#### MEMBERSHIP

Members of the society should be chosen in some way that would make membership valued. It will not do to make a debating society exclusive, but at the same time it is fatal and destroys all enthusiasm to have every person granted membership regardless of interest or qualification. Some such procedure as a tryout, in which the candidates for membership make speeches, might be followed.

#### SIZE

The size of the society should be limited, for much more effective work can be done by a debating society of from fifteen to twenty, than can be accomplished by a society of thirty to forty-five. In case there is a greater number desiring membership than can be advantageously admitted, a second society can be formed. The presence of another organization offers opportunity for competition, which is of great value.

#### MEETINGS

Meetings should be held once every two weeks. To hold meetings more frequently than every two weeks would be to put too great a tax upon their interest. If meetings are held less frequently than this, the interest is apt to lag between sessions.

#### PROGRAM

The program of the different meetings should be interesting and varied. An attempt should be made to secure persons of standing in the community as visitors or as speakers at occasional meetings.

## CONDUCTING MEETINGS

Meetings should always be conducted in an orderly manner, and the person in the chair should not tolerate any form of disorder. However, too much stress should not be laid upon the observations of the minute rules and regulations of parliamentary law. Time spent in technical quibbling and mere parliamentary fencing is, to a large extent, time wasted. Much can be done by the presiding officer in making parliamentary practice worth while if he adopts a policy of observing broad, general principles of parliamentary procedure without putting too much emphasis upon purely technical points.

## PUBLICITY

Considerable publicity should be given to the meetings and debates, for that attaches importance to the activity of the society, and makes the members more anxious to attend and take part.

## COMPETITION

Through inviting competition among the members and among different debating societies, those in charge should endeavor to keep up interest. At given intervals formal debates with outside societies should be held, and trials should be conducted in the society for the purpose of selecting members to represent the organization as a team in these formal debates.

*a. Model Constitution and By-Laws<sup>1</sup>*

The Constitution and By-Laws given here are suggested in the hope that they may serve as a model for high school literary societies. They may be modified and amended, shortened or lengthened, as the society sees fit. They are modeled somewhat after the constitutions and by-laws of the Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Societies of the University of North Carolina.

**Constitution of the.....Literary Society**

## PREAMBLE

Recognizing the permanent good that comes from individual self-expression and organized self-control we hereby form ourselves into a literary society, subject to the following constitution and by-laws.

<sup>1</sup> North Carolina University Record. Extension Series No. 6. p. 47-54. January, 1914. Constitution and By-Laws for High School Literary Societies.

## CONSTITUTION

## ARTICLE I

## NAME AND MOTTO

SECTION 1. The name of this society shall be—"The.....  
Literary Society of....." The motto shall be ".....  
....."

## ARTICLE II

## MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Any student and any teacher in ..... High School may become by election an active member of this society, as provided for in Article II, Section 1, of the By-laws.

SECTION 2. Any person may become by election an honorary member of this society by vote of three fourths of the members present. He shall be entitled to all the privileges of an active member except voting and holding office.

## ARTICLE III

## GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. The government of this society shall be vested in a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, a Treasurer, a Censor, a Critic, a Reporter, a Membership Committee, a Program Committee, and a Committee on the Constitution. In all cases of final appeal a vote of two thirds of the members present shall control.

## ARTICLE IV

## MEETINGS—REGULAR

SECTION 1. Regular meetings shall be held on.....of  
.....week at .....o'clock.

## MEETINGS—SPECIAL

SECTION 2. A special meeting may be called by the President. It shall be the duty of the President to see that the Secretary informs the members of such a meeting.

## ARTICLE V

## MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. The first president every year shall appoint a committee of three, whose duty it shall be to secure, investigate, and report on all proposals for membership. This committee shall hold office throughout the school year.

## ARTICLE VI

## PROGRAM COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. At the first meeting of his term, each president shall appoint two persons who, together with himself, shall act as the program committee. It shall be the duty of this committee to formulate the programs, including the selection of questions for debate, and report the same to the society, and post them in some conspicuous place, at least two weeks before the date for the holding of each program. At this time they shall also read the names of those members whom they have placed on duty. This committee shall have full power to place active members on the program as it may see fit. The society may at any time, by a majority vote, modify or change completely any program in the meeting at which it is reported. The program committee shall hold office until one week after the regular election of officers.

## ARTICLE VII

## COMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION

SECTION 1. The committee on the constitution shall consist of three members. They shall be appointed by the first president at the beginning of each school year, and shall serve throughout the entire school year. In the event, however, that a member of this committee should be elected president the president shall then resign from his membership on the committee, and another shall be appointed in his place.

SECTION 2. Any amendment to the constitution or by-laws shall be referred to this committee. Said amendment shall lie over one week before final action is taken by the committee. In case of favorable action taken by the committee it shall be presented by the committee to the society and shall lie over one week before final action is taken by the society. In case of unfavorable action by the committee, the amendment may be brought before the society by its author, or any member of the society, in which case it shall lie over two weeks before final action is taken upon it.

SECTION 3. This committee shall consider the communication of any member who thinks he has been unjustly fined, and shall have power to abrogate these fines, provided the excuse be deemed sufficient. The action of this committee shall be final, unless its decision be reversed by special action of the

society. A vote of two thirds of the members present shall be necessary to reverse the decision of the committee.

## ARTICLE VIII

### AMENDMENT

SECTION 1. This constitution may be amended at a regular meeting by the vote of two thirds of the members present; provided, that notice of the proposed amendment be read at the two regular meetings that immediately precede.

SECTION 2. This constitution may be suspended at any meeting by a vote of four fifths of the members present; provided, that this suspension shall apply to this particular meeting alone.

## BY-LAWS

### ARTICLE I

#### ORDER OF EXERCISES

SECTION I. The regular exercises of the society shall be conducted in the following order:

1. The roll call.
2. Reading, correction, and approval of the minutes of the last meeting.
3. Installation of officers.
4. Election of members.
5. Initiation of members.
6. Appointment of committee to decide the debate.
7. Order of exercises for the evening.
8. General debate.
9. Report of critic.
10. Decision of the committee to decide the debate.
11. Report of committees.
  - a. Announcement by the program committee of the next two programs.
  - b. Report of committee on the constitution.
  - c. Reports of special committees.
  - d. Report of the treasurer.
12. Election of officers.
13. Unfinished business.
14. New business.
15. Adjournment.

SECTION 2. In the regular debates of the society, the order and length of the speeches shall be as follows:

First affirmative, not less than four nor more than ten minutes.

First negative, not less than four nor more than ten minutes.

Second affirmative, not less than four nor more than ten minutes.

Second negative, not less than four nor more than ten minutes.

First affirmative, in rebuttal, not more than five minutes.

First negative, in rebuttal, not more than five minutes.

Second affirmative, in rebuttal, not more than five minutes.

Second negative, in rebuttal, not more than five minutes.

SECTION 3. Every debate shall be decided by a committee of three persons chosen by the president from the members or visitors present. No officer while on duty shall be required to serve on this committee.

SECTION 4. This society shall be governed by "Robert's Rules of Order" as parliamentary guide in all cases where it does not conflict with the constitution or by-laws.

## ARTICLE II

### ELECTION OF MEMBERS

SECTION 1. Every candidate shall make application for membership in writing. This application shall be reported to the society by the membership committee. The vote shall be by ballot, and three fourths of the members present must vote for the candidate in order for him to be elected to membership.

### INITIATION OF MEMBERS

SECTION 2. The ceremony of initiating an active member shall be as follows: The president and members of the society shall stand; the chairman of the membership committee shall conduct the candidate to the desk of the president; the president shall then ask him if he has read the constitution and by-laws of the society; if he answers affirmatively, the president shall then put to him this question: "Do you pledge your honor that you will support the constitution and by-laws of the . . . . Literary Society, and to the best of your ability promote the welfare of the organization?" Upon receiving an affirmative reply, the president shall direct him to sign at once the roll of membership; and shall then say, "I hereby declare you to be an active member of this society."

## EXPULSION FROM MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 3. On a written motion stating the charge, a member may be expelled from the society for any of these offenses: gross misconduct, persistent failure to perform duty, continued absence from the meetings of the society, deliberate failure to pay dues or fines.

## ARTICLE III

## ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SECTION 1. Officers of this society shall be elected by ballot, a majority of the votes cast electing. They shall be elected every eight weeks. No person shall be eligible to the same office for two successive terms.

## TIME OF INSTALLATION

SECTION 2. The installation of an officer must take place at the second meeting after election; otherwise his office is vacant and must be filled immediately by the election and installation of a new officer. Offices vacant from any other cause must also be filled in like manner.

## CEREMONY OF INSTALLATION

SECTION 3. The ceremony of installing officers shall be as follows: The acting president and the members shall stand; the acting president shall say, "The president elect will please come forward." He will then put to him the question: "Do you solemnly affirm that you will faithfully execute the duties of (here naming the office), and that you will protect and defend the constitution of the.....Literary Society?" Upon answering affirmatively, the president shall then take the chair and in similar form install in turn the other officers.

## DUTY OF THE PRESIDENT

SECTION 4. The duty of the president shall be to preside at all meetings of the society; enforce a due observance of the constitution, by-laws, and rules of order; inflict all fines that are imposed on members of the society; and perform all the duties required of him by the constitution and by-laws.

## DUTY OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT

SECTION 5. The duty of the vice-president shall be to perform all the duties of the President in the absence of that officer from the society.



## DUTY OF THE SECRETARY

SECTION 6. The duty of the secretary shall be to keep a record of the attendance and of the acts of the society, and to perform any services required of him by the constitution, by-laws, and rules of order.

## DUTY OF THE TREASURER

SECTION 7. The duty of the treasurer shall be to collect all money due the society, to pay its debts that have been approved by the president, and secure receipts for their payment, and at the close of his term of office to deliver all property in his possession belonging to the society to his successor. He shall make a report at each meeting of the society in which he shall state the amount of money which he has on hand as treasurer, the members of the society who owe dues, assessments, or fines, the amount that each one owes, and when fines will begin to accumulate for the non-payment of these amounts.

## DUTY OF THE CENSOR

SECTION 8. It shall be the duty of the censor to note down the names, together with the offenses, of all persons guilty of improper or disorderly behavior in the society, to report same to the society, and to the president, who shall inflict proper fines, and to give a list of the same to the treasurer for collection. But if there is no misconduct, he shall report that "The society has been in good order."

## DUTY OF THE CRITIC

SECTION 9. (1.) The duty of the critic shall be to present a just criticism at each meeting of the debate in general and the work of each member who takes part in the program.

SECTION 9. (2.) It shall also be the duty of the critic to audit the books of the treasurer at the close of each term of the treasurer's office and make a report to the society.

## DUTY OF THE REPORTER

SECTION 10. The duty of the reporter shall be to supply for publication in the local newspaper an account of each regular meeting, announcements of programs, and other items of interest pertaining to the society.

## IMPEACHMENT

SECTION 11. If any officer is guilty of neglect of duty or of misconduct in office, he may be arraigned upon a written

accusation of any three members at a regular meeting of the society, provided that a week's notice has been given and the accused has had the privilege of choosing a member as his counsel for defense. He shall be convicted only with the concurrence of two thirds of the members present. If convicted he shall be subject to a reprimand from the presiding officer, fine, suspension, or expulsion, as the society may resolve.

## ARTICLE IV

### DUES

SECTION 1. The regular dues of this society shall be..... and shall be payable not later than.....

### ASSESSMENTS

SECTION 2. An equal assessment on all active members may be imposed at any regular meeting by vote of a majority of the members of the society, this to be paid not later than some definite time, to be decided by the society.

### INITIATION FEES

SECTION 3. The regular initiation fees of this society shall be ..... and shall be payable not later than ..... weeks after initiation.

### FINES

SECTION 4. Any member absenting himself from the regular or special meetings of the society without a valid excuse, such as sickness for instance, shall be fined ....., this to be paid within four weeks after it has been imposed.

SECTION 5. Any member failing to perform duty when put on the program by the committee, without a valid excuse, such as sickness, shall be fined ....., this to be paid within four weeks after it has been imposed.

SECTION 6. Any member guilty of misconduct, or of disrespect to the chair, shall be fined by the president a sum not less than ten cents nor exceeding one dollar, this to be paid within four weeks from the time that it was imposed.

SECTION 7. Any member failing to pay his fines, assessments, initiation fees, or dues, within the limits prescribed in this article shall be fined ..... per week until he pays up in full.

SECTION 8. Any member of a committee failing to perform his duty as laid down in the constitution and by-laws, or rules of order, shall be fined ....., this to be paid within four weeks after it has been imposed.

## ARTICLE V

### AMENDMENT

SECTION 1. Any part of these by-laws may be amended at a regular meeting by the vote of two thirds of the members present; provided, that notice of the proposed amendment be read at the two regular meetings that immediately precede.

SECTION 2. These by-laws may be suspended at any meeting by a vote of four-fifths of the members present; provided, that this suspension shall apply to this particular meeting alone.

### 2. MANAGEMENT AND PROCEDURE

#### a. *Essential Rules of Parliamentary Practice*

Inasmuch as all business brought before a deliberative assembly, such as a debating society, is presented in the form of a motion or resolution, it is necessary that the members of the society should be familiar with at least the principal forms of motions and the general principles of parliamentary procedure. Each society should be provided with a copy of Robert's "Rules of Order" or some other standard manual of parliamentary practice. For convenient reference, a brief summary of the most essential principles and motions, based on Robert's "Rules," is here set forth.

### EXPLANATION OF TERMS

1. QUORUM.—It is customary to require that a certain percentage of the society's membership, called a quorum, be present before the society proceeds to transact business. This percentage is usually provided for in the constitution and by-laws.

2. OBTAINING THE FLOOR.—Before a member can make a motion or address the assembly in debate, it is necessary that he should obtain the floor. It is customary to do this by rising after the previous speaker has "yielded the floor," i. e., resumed his seat, and addressing the presiding officer by his official title, "Mr. President," etc. If the member is entitled to it, the presiding officer assigns him the floor by a nod of the head or by announcing his name.

3. **THE MOTION.**—A motion is a proposal that the society take certain action upon a question. It is made by a member's obtaining the floor as described and saying "I move that .....,," stating the action he wishes to have taken. As a rule only one motion can be made by any member at one time.

4. **SECONDING THE MOTION.**—Nearly every motion requires a second. This is done by a member's saying "I second the motion," which he does without waiting to obtain the floor, and, in small assemblies, even without rising. Where a motion is not seconded at once, the Chair shall ask "Is the motion seconded?"

5. **STATING THE QUESTION.**—When a motion has been made and seconded, it is the duty of the Chair, unless he rules it out of order, to state the question, i. e., put the question before the assembly for consideration. The usual form is "It is moved and seconded that....." followed by a statement of the motion itself. If the question is amendable or debatable, the Chair opens debate by saying "Are you ready for the question?"

6. **VOTING.**—When debate is finished, the Chair asks again "Are you ready for the question?" He then restates the motion and follows by saying "All in favor will vote 'Aye'; opposed 'No.'" Voting may be done by acclamation, by raising the hand, by rising, or by written ballot. Unless otherwise provided for in the constitution, the vote should be taken by the first method, as this is most customary and consumes the least time.

7. **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.**—When a question comes before the society that requires considerable discussion, the society resolves itself into a committee of the whole. This is done by motion. When the society goes into a committee of the whole the president appoints some member as a chairman of the committee. When the discussion is completed the committee rises, the president resumes the chair and the chairman of the committee reports the result.

8. **REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES.**—A part of the business of each society is that of receiving the reports of committees. When a committee is called upon to report, the chairman secures the floor and says "The committee on.....begs leave to report that....., all of which is respectfully submitted." The report may be disposed of by any one of the various kinds of motions.

## MOTIONS

There are many kinds of motions, differing from one another both in the purpose for which they are to be used and also in rank and importance. Some motions may be debated, others may not. Some may be amended, may be postponed, may be referred to a committee, be reconsidered, be laid on the table, others may not. The principal forms of motions are classified here (1) according to purpose for which they are to be used and (2) according to nature and precedence.

## MOTIONS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO PURPOSE

1. Where a member desires a motion to pass, but that the form first be changed, he may move:

(a) *To Amend*.—When the change to be made is trifling and can be made in the assembly.

(b) *To Commit or Refer*.—When much time will be required or more information must first be secured, it is better to *refer* the question to a committee.

2. Where a member desires to defer action on a motion until some future time, he may move:

(a) *To Postpone to a Certain Time*.—This puts off consideration of the question until a certain hour.

(b) *To Lay on the Table*.—This puts the question aside temporarily with the right to take it up at any time when this kind of business is in order:

3. When a member desires to shut off further debate upon a question entirely, or limit it to a certain time he may move:

(a) *To Move the Previous Question*.—This brings the assembly at once to a vote.

(b) *To Limit Debate*.—This determines a time when debate is to cease and the vote is to be taken.

4. When a member wishes to shut off further deliberation upon a question entirely, he may move:

(a) *To Object to Its Consideration*.—This is done before debate has begun.

(b) *To Postpone Indefinitely*.—If this motion is adopted, the main question is killed for the remainder of the session.

(c) *To Lay on the Table*.—For small assemblies this method is considered unfair.

5. When a member wishes to consider a question a second time, he may move:

(a) *To Take from the Table.*—When a question has not been voted on and has been laid on the table, this motion may be used to bring it up for consideration.

(b) *To Reconsider.*—When a motion has been adopted, rejected or postponed indefinitely, and one or more members have changed to the losing side, one on the prevailing side may make a motion to reconsider.

(c) *To Rescind.*—If a motion has been adopted, rejected or postponed indefinitely, and no one is both willing and able to move to reconsider the vote, it can be brought up again by moving to rescind. This requires a two-thirds vote, or a vote of a majority of the enrolled membership, unless notice has been given at a previous meeting.

6. When a member wishes to prevent final action on a motion in an unusually small or unrepresentative meeting, he moves:

(a) *To Reconsider and Have Entered on the Minutes.*—This is done when it is apparent that the action taken is against the views of the majority of the society. The member desiring to make the motion should vote with the prevailing side and then move to reconsider the vote and have it entered on the minutes. This motion can be made only on the day the vote in question was taken.

#### GENERAL CLASSIFICATION OF MOTIONS

The chart on page 94 shows briefly what action may or may not be taken on each of the motions most often used.

Motions are generally classified in five groups:

##### 1. Privileged motions.

- (a) To fix a time to which to adjourn.
- (b) To adjourn.
- (c) To raise a question of privilege.
- (d) To call for the orders of the day.

Privileged motions, on account of their importance, take precedence over all other questions. They are designed especially for securing the rights, comfort and convenience of the members.

##### 2. Incidental motions.

- (a) Questions of order and appeal.
- (b) Suspension of the rules.
- (c) To object to consideration of a question.

Motions.	Must be seconded?	Is debatable?	Can be amended?	Committed?	Postponed?	Postponed indefinitely?	Reconsidered?	Laid on the table?	Renewed?	Subject to previous question?	Vote necessary to pass.
To fix time to which to adjourn.	Yes	No <sup>1</sup>	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	...	No	Ma- jority.
To adjourn.	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Ma- jority.
To raise a question of privilege. <sup>4</sup>	No	Yes	No <sup>4</sup>	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Ma- jority.
To call for the orders of the day (Special.)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Two- thirds.
Questions of order and appeal.	Yes	Yes <sup>2</sup>	No	No	No	No	Yes	No <sup>12</sup>	No	Yes	Ma- jority.
To suspend the rules.	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Usu- ally two- thirds.
To object to consideration of a question.	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes <sup>9</sup>	No	Yes	Yes	Two- thirds.
To lay on the table.	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Ma- jority.
To move the previous question. <sup>5</sup>	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No <sup>13</sup>	Yes	No	Two- thirds.
To close or limit debate	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes <sup>10</sup>	No	Yes <sup>16</sup>	No	Two- thirds.
To extend limits of debate.	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes <sup>10</sup>	No	Yes <sup>16</sup>	No	Two- thirds.
To postpone to a certain time.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ma- jority.
To commit or refer.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes <sup>11</sup>	Yes <sup>14</sup>	Yes	Yes <sup>17</sup>	Ma- jority.
To amend....	Yes	Yes <sup>3</sup>	Yes	Yes <sup>6</sup>	Yes <sup>5</sup>	Yes <sup>6</sup>	Yes	Yes <sup>14</sup>	No	Yes <sup>17</sup>	Ma- jority.
To postpone indefinitely.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ma- jority.
To take from the table.	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Ma- jority.
To reconsider.	Yes	Yes <sup>3</sup>	No	No	No <sup>7</sup>	Yes <sup>3</sup>	No	Yes <sup>15</sup>	Yes	Yes	Ma- jority.
The main ques- tion, or prin- cipal motion.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ma- jority.

<sup>1</sup> If made in an assembly when no question is pending, this becomes a main motion and may be debated. In such case, however, it is no longer privileged.

<sup>2</sup> Each member may speak once. Questions of appeal are undebatable when made while an undebatable question is pending.

<sup>3</sup> Undebatable when the main question is undebatable.

- (d) Motions relating to methods of voting or of making nominations.
- (e) Requests growing out of business pending; as to ask for information; withdraw a motion; or similar privileges.

Incidental motions are those growing out of other motions. They take precedence over and must be decided before the motions out of which they grew.

### 3. Subsidiary motions.

- (a) To lay on the table.
- (b) To move the previous question.
- (c) To limit or extend the limits of debate.
- (d) To postpone to a certain time.
- (e) To commit or refer.
- (f) To amend.
- (g) To postpone indefinitely.

Subsidiary motions are those made for the purpose of disposing of the main motion in some other way than by directly adopting or rejecting it.

### 4. The main question.

This is the principal motion or question under discussion. Main motions are those that bring before the assembly either some new business, or relate to the regular business of the assembly.

### 5. Miscellaneous motions.

- (a) To take from the table.

<sup>4</sup> If member who raises a question of privilege finds it necessary to make a motion, this motion becomes the immediately pending question and is subject to the rules governing any main motion.

<sup>5</sup> The previous question may be moved only when the immediately pending question is amendable or debatable. Unless the question upon which it is moved is specified, it applies only to the immediately pending question.

<sup>6</sup> With the main question.

<sup>7</sup> Unless it is a motion to reconsider the vote on the main question in that case it may be postponed once.

<sup>8</sup> Unless the question is undebatable.

<sup>9</sup> An affirmative vote cannot be reconsidered.

<sup>10</sup> If reconsideration is moved before the time limit has expired

<sup>11</sup> Cannot be reconsidered after the committee has taken up the subject, but by two-thirds vote the committee may be discharged.

<sup>12</sup> Laying an appeal on the table takes everything out of which the appeal rose.

<sup>13</sup> Not without tabling the main question and all motions applied to it then pending.

<sup>14</sup> Tables the entire subject.

<sup>15</sup> Kills the motion to reconsider.

<sup>16</sup> If lost, it may be renewed after there has been sufficient progress in debate to make it a new question.

<sup>17</sup> Forces vote at once.



- (b) To reconsider.
- (c) To rescind.
- (d) To renew.

These are motions, which, because of the rules governing them, and because of their use, do not properly come under any of the above heads.

All of these motions are arranged in order of rank, beginning with the highest, except the motion to reconsider. Each motion takes precedence over one of a lower order, but none except the motion to amend can supersede one of a higher order. The motion to reconsider is in order at any time, and can be applied to every question except to adjourn, to suspend the rules, and to lay on the table (when decided in the affirmative).

### *b. Debating Tryouts<sup>1</sup>*

**METHOD OF SELECTING TEAMS.**—Debating teams should always be selected by competitive tryouts in which each contestant is allowed a specified time to present his side of the question. The time allowed each speaker should in no case be less than five minutes, and it is not frequently necessary to allow longer than ten minutes to give the debater a fair test. The tryout speech should consist of both rebuttal and constructive argument, and should be an effort to present as effectively as possible the one or two essential reasons why the proposition is or is not sound.

In recent years the practice has grown up in college debating tryouts of assigning the general question such as Income Tax, Immigration, Government Ownership, several weeks before the tryout, and a few hours or a day before the tryout of announcing the exact wording of the general question and of drawing for sides. This plan is a good one because it requires careful and extensive preparation on all phases and both sides of the question, and because it guarantees to some extent an extemporaneous presentation of the arguments.

**PLAN FOR CONDUCTING TRYOUT.**—A convenient method of assigning sides and positions in the tryout is to have the contestants draw numbers by lot, those receiving the odd numbers supporting the affirmative, those receiving the even numbers, supporting the negative. Number one, the first affirmative, should divide his time and be required to give a short rebuttal speech after number two, the first negative, has spoken. The

<sup>1</sup> Jones, L. *Manual for Debaters*. p. 26-8. Univ. of Wash. 1913.

speakers then follow in the order of their assignment. Each contestant should hear only the speech to which he is to reply because he could otherwise get valuable suggestions from preceding speakers on the same side of the question.

If the number of contestants is large or if there is some doubt in the minds of the judges as to the relative ability of the debaters, those who have no possible chance of making places may be eliminated in the first tryout and additional tryouts may be held to make the final selection. In the second tryout the speakers may be required to debate the other side of the question, and give more extended rebuttal speeches.

The best judges for debate tryouts are the instructors in the schools holding the tryouts, or others who know the debaters more or less intimately. Complete strangers or outsiders frequently make poor tryout judges because they decide entirely upon the showing made in the tryout and place little or no emphasis on what the debater might be able to do in an actual debate. It is a very common fact that many excellent debaters show up very poorly in tryouts where the inspiration of a real debate is usually lacking, and that brilliant tryout debaters sometimes fall down in the actual debate because they lack the combative spirit necessary for the most effective debating.

#### I. SUGGESTIONS FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF A TEACHER OF ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE.<sup>1</sup>

[The method of selecting contestants described in the previous article is intended especially for the society intending to compete in debate with other organizations. There must be many debating societies whose efforts are limited to contests among their own members only, or who, if engaging in inter-society debates, wish also to conduct a series of local debates for the sake of giving all of their members an equal opportunity to take part. The following article, although a record of classroom work in debate actually carried out by one teacher of argumentation, is included here because it describes methods that could be adapted to the needs of the individual debating society wishing to enlist all of its members in the actual work of debate.—*Comp.*]

When the class is ready for formal argument, after some preliminary work in argumentation and informal debate, we begin on debates in earnest. Some half-dozen live, present-day subjects are given out and each student hands in a first and

<sup>1</sup> English Journal. 2: 389-90. June, 1913. *Work in Debates*. A. G. Grandy.

second choice. These preferences are followed out as far as possible and the class divided into teams of six, three on each side of the question. After a week of general reading, note-taking, and discussion on *both* sides of the question, sides are assigned. The class period during all this is used for conference between teacher and pupil and between colleagues. Good references are brought into class and listed on the blackboard, and the interest runs higher and higher as the material grows and the possibilities of the subject begin to appear. This year our subjects were the Panama Canal, the parcel post, suffrage and the six-year term for President.

At the end of three weeks of solid work of gathering material, dividing points among colleagues, etc., outlines of the *whole* debate are prepared for the teacher's inspection. This year I was fortunate in having in my class six boys who had won big interscholastic debates; so instead of pitting them against young, totally inexperienced debaters, I made them captains over some of the several squads who were at work on their subjects, and the way these captains worked with and for their charges more than vindicated the experiment.

By the fifth week all is in readiness. We dress up the classroom to resemble a clubroom with tables for the chairman (a member of the class) and long tables on either side for the affirmative and the negative. Outside judges are asked in, the teacher sinks into the background, a good many visitors appear, and the debate progresses with due formality. Each of the six speakers has a five-minute speech with one minute extra allowed for rebuttal, the first speaker on the affirmative having three minutes for his rebuttal and to close the debate.

This, it will be readily seen, consumes all of a forty-minute period, allowing only a little time for the sergeant-at-arms appointed by the chair to collect the decisions of the judges. It takes four days of a week to run off all the debates, but the interest of the students and their pride in their success more than repay the teacher for her many hours of drilling and rehearsing. And be it said to the credit of those concerned that this year, out of fifty Juniors scheduled to appear, *not one* was absent on the day appointed for his debate. Not one of them failed, and many obtained results which they, and perhaps their classmates and teachers, had deemed impossible. To show to what an extent the interest in the "Junior debates" pervades the

entire school, it might be added that at the closing debate of the series recently given, just 90 people were crowded into an average classroom and there was not the slightest trace of disorder.

## 2. TRYOUTS IN HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING<sup>1</sup>

In coaching a team, the first thing to be considered is tryouts. The first year it may be difficult to bring out as many students as you wish, but eventually you will have plenty of material. The debaters may try out through their English classes, or debating society, or by signing up with the coach for a series of contests. We have discovered that the latter is the better process. Debate tryouts are advertised three or four weeks before the day for signing up, through the agency of our school paper, bulletin-board announcements, and speeches in the grade rooms. Every student in the tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades who is doing passing work in three fourths of his courses is eligible. As a rule high school students in their first year are too young and immature to be desirable material. After a sufficient number have been signed up, they are asked to prepare three minute arguments on any subject they choose for the tryout. The second tryout comes a week later with speeches of four minutes on the question to be debated. The third week's tryout is held with speeches of five minutes length, and three minutes of rebuttal for each speaker. The fourth and final tryout takes place the fourth week and involves speeches of six minutes length with four minutes rebuttal. This is the time when the judges worry about the wisdom of their choice. If there is practically a tie between two speeches, we conduct a fifth tryout with a new set of judges. The number eliminated at each tryout depends, of course, upon the number to enter in the first place. If we have thirty people trying out the first day, we eliminate six, leaving twenty-four for the second, eighteen for the third, and twelve for the fourth week. Experience has taught me to have a number of teachers for judges rather than to rely on my own judgment alone. If I had relied solely upon my own judgment, we should have lost one of the best high school debaters that Detroit has ever known. Variety of judgment is usually safest; on the other hand, it

<sup>1</sup> Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10: 136-8. April, 1924. Debate Coaching in High School—Benefits and Methods. Ruth E. Huston.

is wise to choose for judges those teachers who know most about the principles of public speaking. Sometimes we have five, sometimes seven; we try to keep the same group throughout the series.

Please note the word "series." Too much cannot be said in favor of a series of tryouts instead of only one or two. A month gives the coach a chance to become well acquainted with the squad; it reveals the weaklings who are out for much honor and no work, or those who never stick to anything long enough to progress; it leaves a residue of people who really want to debate. The race is not always to the swift. Many times those who start well end badly, and vice versa. It is the latter whom we want for debaters, the plucky ones who will fail and fail and work, until finally they achieve. Last year our principal and I were fully convinced that a certain girl would make the team. She went through the first three tryouts with flying colors; her fourth was a distinct failure. In view of her previous record, we gave her a fifth chance but the result was the same. A few weeks revealed the fact that the girl was exceedingly nervous and could never have stayed on, if she had made a place. If the tryouts had been hasty, this girl would have made the team, would have been compelled to withdraw, and thus have furnished conspicuous evidence for those who say that debating is too strenuous.

Even after debaters have outdistanced their fellow-students on the platform, there are several other necessary tests. Is the student *physically* strong enough to carry such an activity in addition to his regular work? Is his *scholarship* record high enough to recommend him? Is he *dependable*? Is he capable of *hard work*? "Yes" will be the answer to all of these questions for most of the faithful who have withstood the onslaught of four tryouts. If you find one who does not meet these acid tests, both the coach and the team are better off without him. I remember too well one boy whom we let slide into a debating team on his reputation. He was exceedingly clever and the school pet; consequently everyone thought he would make a good debater. He thought so too. He refused to work, had his mind on a dozen other activities, and nearly ruined the morale of his team. The day of the debate his cleverness and supreme self-confidence did *not* carry him through. He made a mess of everything from his constructive speech to rebuttal,

so much so that even he had to admit it. A high school debating team is no place for the over-confident, the indolent, the unreliable, those poor in scholarship, or for the physically weak. As soon as a debating coach has learned this, and practices it even in the face of faculty opposition he has diminished his problems by half.

### *Alternates*

Another point to be considered at the time of tryouts is the alternate. A team may go through a whole season without using the alternate in any way. Our teams did this two years, but it is rather unsatisfactory, because, if anything does happen to a member of the team, the alternate is so wholly unprepared that he cannot do justice to himself or his colleagues. Again we have tried having one alternate attend debate practices, participate in rebuttal, and aid the team generally. This is successful if you have an alternate who is willing to work hard, when he is practically sure that he will not participate in a debate. Last year we tried having second teams composed of three alternates each. With this system one is sure of having one alternate ready to replace any member of the first team, the second teams get and give real rebuttal training in their practice debates with the first team, a larger number of students are being trained in debate, more people are being prepared for the following year, and the additional work for the coach is more than offset by the aid which the second teams render. Again, however, here is the difficulty of persuading high school boys and girls that second place is desirable. They are even more sensitive about playing second place than are college students. We partially solved the problem by giving them an inter-school debate with another second team as a goal toward which they could work. The question of handling alternates is largely a matter of tact. There is no doubt that every high school debating team needs alternates, sometimes directly and always indirectly.

### *c. Coaching*<sup>1</sup>

DANGERS AND ADVANTAGES OF COACHING.—A great variety of opinion exists as to how much and what kind of coaching should be given to the debaters. Some regard a debate on the same basis as an athletic contest, and contend that since the primary

<sup>1</sup> Jones, L. *Manual for Debaters*. p. 31-3. Univ. of Wash. 1913.

object is to win any amount of coaching is justifiable. Others think that the system of coaching is so fraught with evils that the safest policy is to allow no coaching whatever. Probably neither of these extreme views is correct. The first policy usually results in a debate, not between the members of the debating teams, but between the respective coaches. The coaches sometimes collect the evidence, make the outline, even write the speeches, and the debaters become mere parrots, memorizing and reciting the well rounded sentences that have been prepared for them. A debate between teams coached in this manner is not a debate at all; it is merely a declamatory contest. On the other hand, where no coaching at all is given, the result is hardly less unsatisfactory. Unless the debaters have had some experience, they come to the contest with inadequate preparation, with no clear conception of the relative importance of the points which they wish to present, and with no logical arrangement or plan either for the main speeches or for the rebuttal.

AMOUNT OF COACHING DESIRABLE.—Some coaching is undoubtedly desirable, and the only question is, what extent of coaching and what kind of coaching is for the best interests of the individual debater. The debating coach may very properly assist the debaters in preparing bibliographies and in collecting books, reports, pamphlets and other source material which is to be used in the preparation of the debate, but he should not do the actual reference work of reading the articles and preparing the data and notes. In preparing the case the coach should meet with the debaters, discuss fully with them every phase of the question and so lead them by their own mental processes to work out the case for themselves. In the practice debates which are held, the coach should follow the same plan of criticism and suggestion, but should be careful not to go too far in impressing his own ideas on the debaters. A mediocre case well worked out by the debater will be of more benefit to him and more effectively presented than an excellent case which is the product of the coach's mind. It goes without saying that the practice engaged in by some debate coaches of writing the speeches of the debaters is absolutely reprehensible and the worst kind of fraud. In all probability the coach could write a much better speech than the debater could, and the debate might be won as a result of that better speech. The purpose of debating is not primarily to win or to improve the mind or reputation of the debate coach, but

to develop the mind and powers of speaking of the individuals who are participating in it.

RESTRICTIONS ON COACHING.—In contracts between high schools or colleges it is very desirable that some provision regarding coaching be made. The constitution and by-laws of the Whitman County and Spokane County High School Debating Leagues of this state contain sections limiting coaching. The following is an extract from the constitution of the Whitman County League:

Coaching shall be limited to:

- (1) Instruction in the art of debating in general;
- (2) Help in the collection of material bearing on the question;
- (3) Correction of such errors in English grammar and rhetoric as would ordinarily be corrected in regular class work in English;
- (4) Drill in delivery.

The preparation of the argument shall be entirely the work of the students. At least three days before each debate the coach of each team shall sign and send to the principal of the opposing high school the following statement: "I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge the preparation of the argument for this debate has been entirely the work of the members of my team who will participate."

The team must not be drilled or coached by an outside party, but must represent the work of the school.

These restrictions are perhaps a little too rigid in limiting the amount of coaching. It is undoubtedly safe and reasonable to permit the coach to discuss with the debaters the various arguments which are to be presented, to point out errors in reasoning and to suggest ways of improving the case.

#### I. COACHING IN HIGH SCHOOLS<sup>1</sup>

The amount of time which intervenes between the final choice of the team and the first debate is one of the most important considerations of coaching. This period should be at least eight weeks in length, while nine weeks is preferable. Although it is desirable to coach a college team in six weeks or perhaps less, high school students require longer training because some of them have never been on the debate platform before, and all of them have a more limited background of political, sociological, civic, economic, and historical facts than do college debaters. Five years of observation of my own and

<sup>1</sup> Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10: 138-42. April, 1924. Debate Coaching in High Schools—Benefits and Results. Ruth E. Huston.



other teams have convinced me that eight weeks are absolutely the minimum for sound preparation for a high school debate. Plenty of coaches attempt to do the work in two or three weeks, and then wonder why their teams are not more successful. Hasty, sketchy, half-prepared work may win now and then, but in the long run success comes most frequently to careful preparation. I recall with a smile the first debate that I coached. We spent exactly two weeks in preparation. Two of the team had never heard an inter-school debate of any sort, while the third member had never even come in contact with a class debate. Another jolt came when one of the debaters finally made clear to me the fact that she did not know the meaning of the term minimum wage, which was the question for debate. It required part of the first week to explain to her the meaning and background of the word, and the remainder of the time to train her to pronounce it. She insisted on saying, "minium wage." Because the three debaters were naturally bright students, they gave their main speeches creditably, and managed to pull through rebuttal. You will probably agree that we received the two votes of the 2 to 1 decision, not because our team was well prepared or doing excellent debating, but by chance. They *happened* to be better than the opposing team; they were not *prepared* to be. The defeated debaters came from a community ten times the size of ours, and were over-confident. Hence, our victory. After the worries of those two strenuous weeks, I resolved never to put another team on the platform without two months of painstaking preparation. The results have more than justified the resolution.

High School debaters like to have a definite schedule, and they have more respect for a coach who insists that they live up to the dates set, than they have for the instructor who lets them dawdle along haphazardly until the last two weeks.

The first week should be devoted to finding the issues and to distributing them among the members of the team. Some coaches assume this responsibility, which is a grave mistake. Rather have the teams discuss what *they think* the issues are at their first meeting. Then at a second meeting, after more discussion based on the ten or more points which each debater has brought, let them decide the three, four, or five main points to be proved. At the end of the first week each speaker should

know what is to be his major point and what position on the team he is to have. Of course shifting is sometimes necessary, but usually the debater is placed for the season.

The second week gives every debater his opportunity to collect new evidence for his own particular points. It is wise to hold team meetings in order to check up on the progress made and to offer criticisms of the evidence found. A coach should meet the team at least three times during the week, and will, of course, be sought out by his debaters for aid at other times. Here again the high school coach must hold more conferences than are necessary for the college coach.

The third week should see the brief written by every member. The coach should present a definite form for the brief and insist that the debaters follow it. Otherwise half of its value for checking inconsistencies, and arranging points in their logical order, is gone. By all means insist that every debater put *every iota of his evidence* into the brief.

Speeches should be written the fourth week. They should also be criticized by the coach and revised by the student by the end of the week. If ten minutes is the length of the constructive speeches, a student should save from two to three minutes for rebuttal at the beginning in order to show the relationship between his speech and that of the preceding speaker, and in order to give continuity to the entire contest. This is the practice of our best debaters, and experience has proved that with training, high school debaters enjoy and profit by this plan.

Debaters must memorize their seven or eight minutes of constructive speech thoroughly. There is nothing more pitiable than a speaker who forgets what he wants to say, unless it is the amateur actor who stumbles haltingly through his lines with an embarrassing period of silence after every paragraph. The very least that any high school debater can do is to learn what he is going to say thoroughly. Some coaches encourage the use of cards, but I never yet saw a high school team who used them without giving to the cards the attention which belonged to the audience.

After the speeches are memorized, work on delivery begins. That means particular attention to standing position, directness, and gestures. It means constant attention to loudness and

clearness of tone, emphasis, pausing, enunciation, and pronunciation. Any coach, no matter how inexperienced, owes it to his team to be a crank, if need be, on pronouncing words correctly and enunciating distinctly.

The last three weeks of rebuttal are unadulterated joy to those who love argument. We have at least three, if not more, complete debates each week with the teams sitting at their respective tables, the alternates acting as timekeepers, the gavel sounding at the appointed times, and *no interruptions*. Sometimes on other days we abandon main speeches altogether, and have rebuttal on a single point until that is exhausted, and then treat other points in the same manner. On still other days we discuss the points which our opponents may raise, and plan lines of attack. Sometimes, but rarely of course, the coach takes the platform and represents the opposition. The debaters enjoy this variety.

Much of the success of any rebuttal work is dependent upon the card index system which high school boys and girls thoroughly enjoy. One year we had one box for the three debaters, but it seems more practical for each debater to have his own box and cards. They also are aided by a division of labor; each debater is responsible for certain points in rebuttal. For example, when the question of the Ruhr came up in connection with the proposition of cancellation of war debts, Norma knew that she was to answer that point, because she had worked out a better refutation than her two colleagues. It is helpful to have each debater particularly responsible for the points of one speech of his opponents. For example, let the first affirmative be responsible for every point mentioned by the first negative speaker. This method fixes responsibility, and permits those who have not yet spoken to concentrate on their own speeches. However, this is by no means to be interpreted as an *absolute* division of labor; every debater must listen carefully to every speech. On the other hand, the debaters have often stated that they liked the plan as a general rule of procedure. Rebuttal means hunting for fallacies, searching for inconsistencies, and answering evidence with evidence that is still more convincing. The best results are obtained when you have either two first teams, or a second team with which to actually debate. Not theory, but practice, practice, practice makes suc-

cessful rebuttal! If it is impossible to have two teams, the alternate and the coach must furnish the opposition, for opposition there must be! Any debating team which has had three weeks of consistent rebuttal practice will revel in the intellectual exhilaration of mental combat, instead of weakly wondering, "What shall we say in rebuttal?"

No debate coaching is honorable which ignores the ethics of the game. Debaters must learn from their coach that juggling statistics, quoting only favorable parts of a passage, and using evidence whose source is either unknown or unworthy are beneath the honor of any participant. They must learn the ethics of the game, demand that a decision once given be final, and subject to no repeal.

The high school coach who completely ignores the physical side of his team is also doing them an injustice. The debaters do not realize that from one to six months' work on a given subject requires physical as well as mental endurance. The coach does, or should. Having chosen the physically strong, the coach should do his best to keep them fit. Many a time my debaters have ridiculed the idea. Many of them have exclaimed in disgust, "Oh, I am so tired of hearing 'Nine hours sleep, three meals a day, and some time out-of-doors.'" At the end of the season those same debaters have appreciated the demand, while their parents have thanked me most heartily. Loss of sleep, food, and fresh air will ruin the best of debaters. Never yet have I known a single high school debater who lived up to these rules to break down physically. This is partly due to the fact that they were coached to believe that debating like athletics demands physical fitness.

Any coach has missed half of his chance for success when he ignores the principle of team-work. From the very first, help them to realize that the three are one, working together on one side for one purpose. Whatever is said by one member commits the whole team. Like the British Cabinet, they rise and fall together. Train them to believe that their greatest success will come through the subordination of the individual to the team, that it is the team and the team pulling together that wins. When victory comes, it is earned, not by one speaker, but by the team. The conceited prodigy whose cleverness demands the whole platform has no place in debating.

Defeat, victory, and work must be shared equally by the three, if debating is to achieve its best results.

## 2. EVILS OF OVER-COACHING<sup>1</sup>

The most serious evil which unappreciative teachers have brought upon high-school debate is that of over-coaching. So gross have been the offenses in this direction that they surpass the bounds of honor. A team representing an Ohio city of ten thousand inhabitants last winter confessed after the contest (which they won [?]) that their coach—a woman teacher of English—wrote their direct argument and that they themselves were practically ignorant of the subject discussed. Their rebuttal, instead of being framed from prepared material arranged on the platform to combat the opposition, was actually read verbatim from sheets written before the occasion and briefly annotated during the discussion by the alternate, the only member of the team who had carefully studied the question. This is an authentic case, for which the writer has the proof. He himself saw another team, representing a New York village of five thousand population, read their refutation speeches in a similar manner. But in this case there was no proof but that the speakers wrote what they read. This is not high-school debate. It is the declamation of a joint-argument between English teachers. No wonder some of us are so discouraged as almost to despair of the successful continuance of interscholastic contests. To frame a set of rules under which all interscholastic debating must be coached would be a difficult piece of work, but this is the very task to which we must address ourselves. A coach is very useful, almost inevitable. But no boy profits from dishonest or from unappreciative coaching. The coach has no right to think up an argument for the team. He should simply direct and suggest. He may rightly put materials before the team, advise them when they seek guidance, show them orderly methods and cunning devices. He may criticize their outlines, but not rewrite them. He may cut mixed metaphors from their speeches, but not mixed arguments. Some such rules as these are not only for the sake of honesty, but for the sake of the boy. He may win the other way; but he will never learn to debate nor to become the self-reliant speaker and clear-headed thinker that real debating would make him.

<sup>1</sup> English Journal. 3: 94-8. February, 1914. Appreciation and Management of High School Debate. A. T. Otis.

*d. Judging the Debate*<sup>1</sup>

UNCERTAINTY OF THE JUDGES' DECISION.—The decision of the judges is not the most important feature of the debate. The really essential things are that the contest is a genuine intellectual battle between the opposing teams, and that each side has put forward its strongest arguments in a convincing manner. The side which loses the decision gets fully as much good from the discussion as the side which wins. In evenly contested debates the decision is largely a matter of luck, depending upon the individual preference of the judges. It is impossible in probably a majority of debates to say positively that one side has won and that the other side has lost. The judges' decision at best is merely an approximation in many cases. This is not a reflection upon the judges, but a recognition of the fact that it is impossible to secure exactness and certainty in what is essentially an inexact and uncertain matter. In courts of law, an elaborate system of rules has developed governing the examination of witnesses and admissibility and weight of evidence, the purpose of which is to render a correct decision possible. Yet, even here, the number of appeals and reversals, of miscarriages of justice, testify that the decisions are not always right. How, therefore, can the decision of the judges in a debate where there are no such rules of evidence, where the questions under discussion are of far greater breadth and difficulty than purely legal propositions, and where the judges are not experts, be any more than a mere estimate?

But while recognizing the impossibility of always deciding a debate correctly, it is still desirable to have judges. The desire to win is the strongest possible stimulus to a thorough study of the question. There is no other force in the world so effective in encouraging the complete mastery of a question as the desire to conquer an opponent in a fair and friendly contest. To eliminate this element would be to withdraw the main incentive to hard work in the preparation for the debate. For this purpose, if for no other, the judges should be retained.

SELECTION OF JUDGES.—Considerable care should be exercised in the selection of judges. Nearly all questions have a radical and a conservative side and it is desirable that both elements should be present on the board of judges. Sometimes it is pos-

<sup>1</sup> Jones, L. *Manual for Debaters*. p. 31. Univ. of Wash. 1913.

sible to secure capable judges who have no pronounced opinion on the question or predilection toward one side or the other. But if the question is a public one, every person who would be called upon to act as a judge has probably formed some opinion which cannot help but influence his decision in some degree. Quite frequently this fact operates unfairly against the side which he favors; because of his desire to be absolutely fair he may decide against the side in which he believes.

The best policy to follow in making up the board of judges is to select men who are interested in and well-informed on public questions, who have broad sympathies and upright characters, and who have no personal interest in the outcome of the debate.

### I. INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES<sup>1</sup>

The following sections from the constitution of the Montana High School Debating League sum up the important matters to which judges should attend. A few explanatory notes are added in parentheses.

VI. 3. At all contests the debaters shall be separated from the audience and shall receive no coaching while the debate is in progress.

(It is far easier to deliver a memorized speech than to talk "extemporaneously" from notes. High school debating is valuable largely to the degree that it teaches young people to think and to express their thoughts effectively. Debaters who do "speak from their feet" should be given precedence over those who have merely memorized declamations. "Extemporaneous" speaking does not preclude, of course, the most thorough preparation. Judges will do much toward raising the standards of debating if they will distinguish between declamation and speaking from the floor.)

6 a. No new argument is allowed in any of the last six speeches.

(New *evidence* may well be introduced into these rebuttal speeches, but new *arguments* are forbidden.)

VII. 1. At each contest there shall be three judges who shall be selected on the basis of capability and impartiality.

(3a.) During the debate the judges shall sit apart from one another.

<sup>1</sup> Montana. University Extension Department. Montana High School Debating League. p. 15-16. August, 1928.

(3b.) They shall base their decision on the merits of the debate, not on the merits of the question.

(This is necessary in the very nature of academic debating. Sides are often assigned by lot. The problem before the judges is not to decide which side is *right*, but rather which team has presented the truth on its side most effectively and persuasively. The "Suggestions to Judges," given below, are intended as further assistance in the application of this section.)

(3c.) Each judge at the conclusion of the contest, without consultation with any other judge, shall write on a card the word "affirmative" or "negative," seal it in an envelope, and deliver it to the presiding officer, who shall open the envelope in the sight of the two leaders and announce to the audience the decision.

### *Suggestions to Judges*

(To be read before each debate.)

The purpose of these suggestions is to make clear to both judges and debaters what is expected from them, and thus to assist the judges in the performance of their task, often difficult and perplexing, and the debaters in their preparation and practice.

The distinction made between "argument" and "presentation" is purely academic, but it is necessary and important. "A debate is not a declamatory contest; neither is it a dry, uninteresting statement of quotations, facts and figures. A good scholastic debate is a strong, effective presentation of a clear and logical thought upon the platform with opponent. A judge should carefully weigh both excellence in thinking and excellence in speaking; he should award his decision to the team which shows the most effective combination of the two in vital give-and-take discussion." Of course, skilful thinking is more important than skilful speaking, and should be so rated.

#### A. ARGUMENT

The matter of these pages is largely taken from the bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, "How to Judge a Debate." These pages have not been officially adopted by the debating league, and schools are free to modify them as they please.

1. Each member of the teams should show general knowledge of both sides of the question.



2. The debaters should confine themselves to a few main issues of the question, avoiding the unimportant, so that the debate falls into a few sharply marked divisions and is not a mere jumble of statements.

3. They should define a clear-cut, intelligent interpretation of the question early in the debate. If each side contends for a different interpretation of the question, the wise judge will agree with the side which upholds the simple intended meaning, the meaning which an intelligent man attempting to arrive at the real issues, would give to the question. Far-fetched, technical, quibbling interpretations should be discouraged.

4. Rebuttal should be confined to the main issues and may well be scattered through the debate. A marked difference in the style of the rebuttal speeches and those of direct argument is a sign of poor preparation.

#### B. PRESENTATION

1. A vigorous, aggressive conversational style is best.

2. Grammar and diction should uniformly be good, but occasional slips, often indicative of extemporaneous speaking, should not be penalized.

3. Gestures should be simple and natural. It is better to have none than to be artificial.

4. The signals to cease should be scrupulously attended to; every speaker should stop at once, even if in the middle of a sentence.

5. The greatest elements in effective presentation are earnestness and clear thinking; these may even overbalance roughness, awkwardness and inexperience.

6. Debate is a contest, and the preference should be given to the team which actually meets the arguments of the opponents, which handles its notes with familiarity and command, which shows, in short, that its rebuttal is a matter of present thought and not of memorizing.

#### II. THE EXPERT JUDGE<sup>1</sup>

Though there is still a considerable, though lessening, demand for judged debates on the part of the students of our colleges and universities, many have given up altogether the old-style board

<sup>1</sup> White, H. Adelbert. *Decisions in Debates*. In *Nebraska University. Eighteenth Annual Bulletin*. 1927. p. 15-16.

of three judges. Thirty-five institutions reported a total of nearly 350 debates for last season, and of this total some 237 were judged by one of the newer methods or were not judged at all. Thirty-two no-decision debates are reported; 57 were judged by a single or critic judge; 43 by the audience alone; and 6 by three judges and the audience, allowing four votes in all. Whatever method of decision is indicated, opinion seems to be spreading that debates to win votes are now fading from the picture.

It seems to be true, however, that the so-called expert or critic judge has not entirely come into his own. Opinions indicate a divided mind as to whether he is a total success. Replies to the questionnaire indicate considerable difference in range of approval as a few quotations will show:

"A good expert judge can do much for a team, although individual debaters often are inclined to be better satisfied with the opinion of three instead of one."

"Fairly satisfactory, but I believe decision by vote of the audience, where it is not composed of partisan students, is to be preferred."

"Judge has prejudice and opinions as to the question and methods of debate, which are as effective in making wrong decisions as any prejudice in the audience. I favor audience decisions."

"We have tried it only once, in an oratorical contest, and were deeply disappointed."

"Have used it but once, and then not satisfactory."

"Excellent; the only system that possesses educational values."

"Impossible to find a qualified expert."

"We much prefer the audience decision."

"Undoubtedly the best plan yet tried here."

"Better than a board of judges, especially when he renders his decisions and basis for it before the audience as a whole."

"We do not use this plan at all, preferring a vote by the audience."

"I don't care for it. We like to mix in a few decision debates."

"Expert judge is useful only when he will tell the audience and the debaters the good points and the weaknesses of their teams. We prefer no-decision, open forum debating."

"More satisfactory than a board of three, but we do not favor decisions of any sort."

"Have not used it lately, but approve of the expert judge in principle."

### III. AUDIENCE DECISIONS IN DEBATING<sup>1</sup>

The Quarterly Journal for February, 1924, contained a brief account of the "before and after taking" method of debate judging as used in the debate between Western Reserve University and Washington and Jefferson College. At the Dartmouth-Columbia debate this year, a similar experiment was tried, except that the decision of the audience was supplementary to the customary judges' decision on "the merits of the debating."

As each member of the audience entered the hall, he was provided with a ballot, both sides of which bore the following statement:

"I am  
 Strongly favorable .....  
 Slightly favorable .....  
 Neutral .....  
 Slightly opposed .....  
 Strongly opposed .....  
 to joining the World Court."

One side of the ballot was labeled "before the debate," the other side, "after the debate." This manner of printing the ballots made it possible to trace the shift of any individual's opinion without issuing him two ballot numbers in duplicate, as suggested by Mr. Hudson. The hearer recorded his position on the World Court both before and after the debate by checking the word which most nearly expressed his conviction, the chairman of the meeting making it clear that the voting had nothing to do with the decision on the merits of the debate.

Exactly one third of the audience recorded at least a slight shift of opinion as a result of the discussion. By a simple arithmetical calculation it was possible to determine whether the audience as a whole had been influenced toward support of the World Court or against it. The figures indicate that that hypothetical, but very important individual, "the average person

<sup>1</sup> Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:315-16. June, 1924. Judging the Debate from the Floor.

in this audience," was slightly predisposed toward the World Court before the debate, and that debate strengthened his belief. This may mean that the affirmative speakers were more effective debaters than their opponents, thus corroborating the decision of the judges; or it may merely mean that the argument in support of the World Court is inherently superior to the argument that may be presented against it. If we disregard the distinction between "strongly favorable" and "slightly favorable," and between "strongly opposed" and "slightly opposed," the distribution of votes was as follows:

Before the debate

Aye—58

No—19

Neutral—13

After the debate

Aye—64

No—20

Neutral—6

It is apparent from these figures that the new converts to the World Court were won from the neutral group; which recalls the old political campaigner's advice: "Talk to the man on the fence; he will swing the election and you can't convince the opposition anyway."

#### IV. NO-DECISION DEBATES<sup>1</sup>

If the debaters of the University of California have learned any lessons from experience, it is that debating in order to convince judges does not serve the best interests of the activity. No decision debating represents an attempt to place the "greatest American indoor sport" upon its highest plane, free from many of the criticisms that have often been directed at it.

The most fundamental reason for presenting the pros and cons of a proposition without the necessity of convincing one or more judges is that such a necessity is in its very nature opposed to a fair, impartial, unbiased presentation of the case. Debating for victory tends to bring the methods of the professional athletic coach into the intellectual realm—and Californians feel that such methods are incompatible with the spirit of scholarship. Debating for touchdowns has too often resulted in "hidden ball plays" which have left the audience in utter confusion as to the merits of the question.

<sup>1</sup> Gavel. 11:14. January, 1929. No-Decision Debates. Ewald T. Grether.

The spirit of the new style of debating may be best shown by the closing remarks of one of the California men in a recent debate with Stanford: "We have not attempted to convince you that we alone are correct. However, we have attempted to present what we consider to be as sound a case as can be made for the affirmative of the proposition. It is your privilege to draw your own conclusions after weighing the complete case as presented by both sides."

Specifically, no decision debating allows for the fairest possible analysis of the proposition under discussion, allows the debaters to impart worthwhile information to the audience rather than taking the time allowed in an effort to hang the opponents on the horns of a dilemma, or in jamming sixteen logical or illogical intricacies into ten minutes, by the clock!

Not only is it possible to treat the question in a more unbiased fashion, but it is equally possible to consider the interests and needs of the audience. After all, the majority of the audience is not of the type from which judges would be selected, yet under old style debating this fact is of necessity disregarded.

It is sometimes stated that no-decision debating causes a decline in the quality of the work done because debaters do not have the same incentive to intensive effort. The recent experience of California indicates that this criticism is unfounded. Debating on the merits of the question and for the benefit of the audience seems to offer as adequate an incentive as the old method. Whatever danger there may be of lack of incentive to real effort seems to be overcome by the open forum following the debate. No University man wants to be shown up in public—and only the well informed, alert individual is prepared to stand up under a third degree grilling of an audience.

Finally, the new style represents a decided improvement from the standpoint of the choice of speakers for a given debate. Decision debating forces the debating coach to use only top-notchers in order that he may have a successful season from the standpoint of victories. And top-notchers from the standpoint of victories obtained from judges are not necessarily superior in intellect, reasoning capacity or in future possibilities.

Taking it from all angles, California feels that no decision, open forum debating is the most significant single change tending to elevate the plane of inter-collegiate debating.

*e. New Systems of Debating*I. THE OXFORD SYSTEM OF DEBATING<sup>1</sup>

Oxford, in its recent tour of American universities, including Bates, Swarthmore, Columbia, Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and the University of Pennsylvania, followed more or less the British or parliamentary system as exemplified in debates in the Oxford Union. At Princeton, Swarthmore, and Yale, the teams were split, with one Englishman on the American side, and one American on the British team. Only Bates retained the traditional judges. At every school the audience voted on the merits of the question.

The Oxford Union Society, from whose members the team in America was selected, is a literary-social club founded a century ago, the most important and famous of the numerous Oxonian societies; it includes several hundred students from the twenty-odd colleges. The Union, with the presiding officer's dais, the benches for the government and the opposition, the party leaders and the "aye" and "no" exits, duplicates the House of Commons. Each of the four speakers for the evening is assigned to the side that represents his convictions. He wears evening dress and takes his subject seriously. With little or no reference to his colleague he gives his individual argument, usually some fifteen minutes long. If he persists, no bell shuts him off. A polite note from the secretary may remind him of the time. He follows no formal brief, reproduces no carefully wrought manuscript. The constant heckling may inspire him to unexpected power in argument. He tries to be natural, informal, conversational; he scores with his wit, invective, and persuasiveness, more than with statistics and frowning evidence. No stiff-necked judges pass on the "merits of the debate." The aim is to establish conviction rather than to gain a technical decision; to arrive at the truth rather than to play a game. An open forum, with perhaps fifteen or twenty speeches from the floor, follows. Finally, not long before midnight, the three or four hundred members divide and vote on the merits of the question, usually a problem of national or international policy. Thus the British system is a judgeless, open forum, parliamentary

<sup>1</sup> Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10: 215-22. June, 1922.  
Shall American Universities Adopt the British System of Debating. A. C. Baird.

discussion rather than a competitive sport,—not entirely dissimilar to the open forum debates with which American universities of the middle west have experimented. In his purpose, style, and delivery the Oxford collegian thus differs sharply from the conventional American debater.

A number of American colleges, Swarthmore, for example, have adopted the Oxford plan. A committee, appointed by the Debating association of the colleges of Pennsylvania, has recently recommended that the institutions represented "should endeavor to interest their students in the open forum type of debate, to diminish the emphasis on debate as a sport," and "to hold this year, if possible, one intercollegiate debate" of the parliamentary or British type. Several colleges in Pennsylvania, according to Professor White of Washington and Jefferson, have tried this plan "with success." Is this movement merely the desire to seek after some new thing in college forensics? Or does the British plan have sound educational merits that justify its general adoption? (1) Will the adoption of the British system mean a loss of collegiate interest in debating? (2) Will the students who follow this judgeless method submit to the thorough preparation characteristic of the conventional American debate? Will they continue to respect sound reasoning based upon broad and exact knowledge of the question? (3) Under the British system will they develop more ardent convictions? (4) Will they have a less artificial and a more attractive forensic style? (5) Will they argue with more conversational ease and directness?

The substitution of the Oxford plan for the familiar practice would probably result in less undergraduate enthusiasm for the art of debate. The British system proposes to discuss a question on its merits and to foster genuine conviction. To secure this laudable end, the Oxonian logically eliminates competition. Debating as a game, with time-limits, judges, teamwork, and debating strategy, is regarded as inconsistent with the sincere and effective presentation of individual belief. Accordingly the judges, however few or many, are banished. The listener, in order that he may be free and unhampered in his search for truth, must avoid thinking in terms of a "team," whether it represents his literary society, his class, or his school. Partisanship colors his judgment and destroys the spirit of the discussion. Doubly to ensure unbiased attention to the issues, teams should be "mixed" as the Oxford teams in America were "mixed."

Team work, too, because it cramps the expression of the individual and sometimes apparently commits the speaker to team sentiments inconsistent with his beliefs, must be avoided. Consistency in this matter calls for two speakers rather than three, and one rather than two. Now it is clear that you cannot have a real football game with no teams, no judges, no goal posts. It is equally clear that you cannot have a debating contest after you have deliberately scrapped the machinery. British universities have no such contests. Under such conditions I fail to see why two universities should have strong incentive to get together. With school spirit eliminated, with no "home" or "visiting" teams (mind you, they should be so arranged that each "team" is made up of one visitor and one home debater), with the sport element conscientiously suppressed, it is hard to conceive of audiences in considerable numbers following the debates year after year, and especially hard to conceive debaters undergoing that thorough preparation peculiar to the American debate.

"The impetus to true conviction," say the advocates of the parliamentary type, "will be sufficient to call out the best student minds and to guarantee at least as complete preparation as now takes place." It is to be doubted whether discussion for the mere sake of setting forth opinion will attract numbers of students or lead them to undergo that vigorous preparation made by the debater who is out to win.

The responsibility is upon those who would banish judging and the other elements of contest debating, to make clear that a substitute motive to secure prolonged and intensive training would be provided. Mere ambition to utter the truth and discomfort the rival would scarcely be a dependable spur. Election to an honorary society, the opportunity of the men to match wits with the women of a neighboring school, the prospect under a skilled chairman of reply to questions from the floor, the stimulus of a discussion with speakers from a British university,—such motives would occasionally draw a crowd and call forth fine debating energy. Such motives, of course, are exceptionable.

To point out that the Oxford Union, without judges and competitive discussion, is the "greatest debating society in the world," is insufficient. The Oxonian, with his intellectual traditions and keen interest in the well-being of the Empire, finds satisfaction in mounting the platform, even though no judges appear. Politics to him is as important as cricket or Henley.



Oxford is at the heart of the Empire. Over his tea he settles the fate of Ghandi; his Thursday night debate is merely a continuation of his dinner conversation. Later he will probably enter parliament—as did Gladstone, Salisbury, Birkenhead, and many others whose portraits line the Union walls. Under the parliamentary plan of election he may stand for any English or Scotch constituency. You cannot transfer to the American student this practical Oxford motive for debate any more than you can transfer the incommunicable spirit of Balliol to an American college. To assume that the peculiar conditions which produce exceptional debaters at England's oldest university can at present be duplicated in the American college is of course absurd. Until an equivalent incentive can be demonstrated, those of us who are associated with institutions in which the debating spirit is still glowing will continue to incline toward the contest feature.

The discussion above assumes that American debating is fairly successful in securing proper training and in attracting interested audiences. As a matter of fact, critics point to the decadence of student debates at many of our universities. Therefore it is necessary, in passing, to remind ourselves of the facts, ample proof for which may be found in recent files of the *Gavel* and other forensic journals: that debating for a decision has beyond question raised the standard of forensics set by the older college literary societies; that audiences recently attending the more important contests have been at least as large as those of fifteen or twenty years ago; that competition for teams has been keen enough to draw out large numbers of representative university men; that scores and scores of intercollegiate contests are held annually and that the number is growing; that honorary debating fraternities have expended and have demonstrated their vitality; that governors, prominent educators, and justices of higher courts serve as judges and give highest recognition of the sport; that in many educational quarters the debating contest, rightly or wrongly, has been regarded as a gage of intellectual efficiency of the college; finally, that the argumentative sport has spurred on the student to that educational discipline and mental activity for which, it is argued, the liberal college chiefly exists.

Does the English debater undergo the same systematic and rigid preparation? As he discusses his problem from the plat-

form, does he know his subject as does the American? According to the leaders of the Oxford Union, the debater may "spend a few hours, at most a few days," in his training for the discussion. The actual occasion is one for facility rather than for penetrability. It is not too much to say that the broad and sound preparation characteristic of American debating is unknown at Oxford. The responsibility, again, is upon those who would establish this latter system to show that this thoroughness would not be sacrificed.

Even, however, if we grant that debating has so-called educational values and that an adequate substitute for the "sport" or "game" image may be provided, we are confronted with the familiar indictment made by Roosevelt and others that it is impossible to retain the competitive character of debating and at the same time to engage in a "sincere discussion of public questions." Debating, it is charged, produces demagogues and sophists. A somewhat similar charge is that its atmosphere is that of fighting feudalism rather than that of modern science with its dispassionate investigation of truth, its constantly corrected judgments, and its cooperative spirit. We want, it is claimed, not the legal but the scientific attitude. In reply it should be said, in the first place, that teachers of rhetoric settled generations ago the principle that debaters must not divorce debating from ethics, and that speakers must argue in accordance with their convictions. Horace Mann, in a letter dated June 16, 1851, and printed in many an old debating handbook wrote: "Adopt that side [of the argument] which judgment and conscience assure you to be right." Again, it needs little investigation to make clear that undergraduates have few settled convictions in regard to debate problems. With good conscience they may take either side. Furthermore, despite frequent assertions to the contrary, debaters do investigate both sides and do appreciate the force of the opposing arguments. Again, the debater, although an artist, through his careful analysis, weighing of the problem, sifting of issues, and accumulation of evidence, displays the temper and method of the scientist. Both are dedicated to the "ramifying search for truth." The disputant, moreover, with his conscience and scientific spirit, also recognizes that his conclusions are only tentative, indeed that fresh truth over night may lead to a complete revision of his judgment. He would agree that each debate is, after all, only a step in the broad experiment

to arrive at a stable conclusion, and that four or six speakers do not pretend to speak *ex cathedra*. Furthermore, like the scientist, the debater recognizes the cooperative element in discussion. He does more than convince an audience; he thinks and speaks with those hearers. The result is a social discussion and a social decision. Like the scientist, too, he learns to clarify and to arrange, and to ignore no part of the field of investigation. Hence is logical justification for pitting team against team. Such team work, it should be added, need not be at the expense of that fine individualism of the Oxonian who, like Emerson's scholar, "learns to detect the gleam of light which flashes across his mind from within more than the lustre of firmament of bards and sages." In general, the disposition to separate sharply the debating from the scientific attitude is unjustified. These considerations all indicate that the debating game properly played should not necessarily produce sophists, archaic militarists, or unscientific investigators.

Two other advantages claimed for the British system are that it makes for better style and for better delivery. The English debating style is philosophical and literary, just as ours is practical and legal. The differences, quite pronounced, are due not so much to contrasted debating systems as to markedly differing national experience and training. The Englishman has behind him his classical schooling, his intimacy with Greek and Roman orators, and his own rich literature and culture. His style, therefore, is comparatively dignified, original, at times even poetic. The first Oxford speaker in debate with Bates in September showed familiarity with Lincoln, Walt Whitman, Barrie, Plato, Arnold, Huxley, Browning, the Bible, and other sources. The style was idiomatic, spontaneous, unaffected. Such phrasing and allusion would for an American be pedantry. Our undergraduate texts are standard works on economics, statistical abstracts, speeches of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Our collegiate style, in as far as it is original and virile, is the expression of our peculiar political and educational inheritance. Our faith in a rigid constitution, our exaltation of the Supreme Court, explain sufficiently the character and popularity of our judicial style of debate. And for many a year we are not likely to have done with this practical or judicial spirit. Even if our colleges should adopt the British debate formula, our speakers will con-

tinue to echo the language of Hamilton and Lincoln rather than that of Burke or Morley.

Certainly much improvement needs to be made in this matter of style. We can break with the extreme rigidity that is neither American nor literary. More and more we must establish an alliance between literature, philosophy, and argument. We may work out a more spontaneous style without the necessity of our reproducing or imitating the Oxford Union method and style of discussion. The problem is, of course, one of revising the college curriculum rather than that of imposing a "literary" style on the debater.

In delivery, too, we may take a leaf from the example of Oxford. We must admit that our debaters, racing against time, "neglect the graces of public speech—the play of personality." The Oxford man, let us candidly agree, is more at home before his audience than is the American. The Oxonian takes time on the platform to reflect, to cultivate delightful informality and even intimacy with his auditors. Again, however, the social and political background may explain somewhat the difference. To get the proper accent and inflection, our Yankee would need also to import the British cabinet system of government, the spirit of Hyde Park, the experience with popular judgment. Surely, though, we can overhaul our performance so that our speakers shall be at least human, conversational, and within limits even humorous. To this end we may have only two speakers on a side, and merge the rebuttals into lengthened main speeches. At the Oxford-Bates debate in September the rebuttals were eliminated and the main speeches, by agreement, were unlimited in length. Each speaker used more than thirty minutes. The audience gave close attention until the final speaker stopped at eleven-thirty o'clock. The delivery of the home team was in several respects superior to that of previous Bates teams. Let us also encourage questions from the floor, attach a forum, and call for a popular vote on the merits of the question. These things, I believe, can be done without the sacrifice of a compact, logical style, and the other virtues of our competitive debating.

In conclusion, our traditional debate has a value too great to be disregarded. If the practice here and there has fallen upon evil times, the reason lies not in the mendacity of the speakers, the artificiality of the game, or the presence of the judges, but

rather in the complexities,—or shall I say confusion?—of undergraduate life. A proper remedy for the ills of debating would seem to lie in adequate faculty supervision and guidance. This conclusion, I am aware, is trite, but it needs emphatic reaffirmation. Minimize excessive legalism. Establish an open forum. Penalize the unimaginative and dull delivery. Recall the debaters to a solid intellectual program. Resort only sparingly to the “twenty-four hour” contests. Make room for “discussion group” meetings. Finally, provide, in addition to the present debates, opportunities for exercises of the character suggested by the typical British discussions.

## II. OPEN FORUM DEBATING<sup>1</sup>

A word as to the form of the contest used seems justified by the many inquiries received and the occasional misunderstandings as to what constitutes an open forum debate. Usually each college has entered but two speakers, one on each side of the question. This split team feature eliminates any disposition on the part of the audience to align itself with the home team and facilitates the selection of speakers according to their natural bias upon the question. The time limit for the speakers has varied from a minimum of fifteen minutes to a maximum of no limit at all, and the practice of allowing the first speaker a short rejoinder is usually settled by mutual agreement. After the close of the programmed speeches the open forum is held, subject to the governance of the presiding officer; the main speakers may not re-enter unless questioned. At the close of the discussion the audience votes upon the merits of the question, by ballot, by show of hands or such form of division as may be preferred. An interesting variation in the voting is obtained by taking two ballots from the audience, one recording their opinion at the start of the debate as favorable, neutral or opposed to the question, the other at the end. Assuming the first ballot to be accurate, a comparison of the two reflects the persuasive power of each team rather more definitely than a simple division on the question, as there may be a considerable change of opinion from negative to affirmative, let us say, which might still be insufficient to overcome an overwhelmingly negative opinion at the start. It will be seen then that there is no fixed form of open forum debate. It is susceptible of many modifications.

<sup>1</sup> *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, 10:340-5. November, 1924. *Two Years of Open Forum Debating at Swarthmore*. Philip M. Hicks.

Those outlined above seem best adapted to the aims we have had in view . . .

That open forum debates are interesting has been the general comment of those who have attended them, but the number attending them has not increased or decreased perceptibly. There has been no revival spirit attendant upon the introduction of open forum debate, nor is there likely to be. It must make its way slowly if at all. The most hopeful development along the line of awakening interest during the past year has been the close cooperation of the Debate Board, the forensic governing body, with the Polity Club, the student organization devoted to the discussion of public affairs. The activity of some such organization seems to be almost indispensable to the development of debating as an undergraduate interest. Debating ought to be the result of a keen and vital interest in the discussion of public affairs, instead we are having to use it as a means of stimulating that interest, reinforcing it with college credits, with Delta Sigma Rho keys, student honors and such materialistic sources of appeal.

Open forum debating has suffered in some quarters from the opinion that it is a mere imitation of the English method, of necessity futile because of the obvious impossibility of reproducing the atmosphere and traditions of Oxford in American colleges. This is an unfortunate misconception. Surely we may acknowledge freely our debt to the visiting Oxonians for the example they have given us of clear, witty and persuasive speech without seeking to copy either their institutions or their motives. Open forum debating existed in America prior to the English invasion. Its essential features have been employed at Swarthmore in local contests for at least five years . . .

Although probably nothing has been "proved conclusively," the two years trial of the open forum plan in intercollegiate debating has confirmed our favorable opinion of it, and has indicated progress toward the accomplishment of the aims we have had in view. It has held the interest and enthusiasm of the debaters; it has resulted in more interesting debates and has shown signs of becoming an effective agency in developing a more direct and persuasive style of speech. While it has not noticeably increased the size of debate audiences, except in the case of the Oxford debates, it has interested audiences to a degree that gives grounds for hope that the ultimate result may be a more general attend-

ance and a wider undergraduate interest in public discussion of current affairs.

### III. THE OREGON PLAN<sup>1</sup>

The following method of no-decision debating is the result of a process of experimenting principally in our University High School and our Public Speaking classrooms. Next year we hope to adopt it in all our University debating. We have scheduled a debate later this year with the University of Utah in which we shall use this plan.

#### THE OREGON PLAN

1. The first affirmative speaker presents the entire Affirmative case in a speech of twenty minutes length.

2. The first negative speaker presents the entire Negative case in a speech of twenty minutes length.

3. The first affirmative speaker returns to the platform and is cross-questioned concerning his case by the second negative speaker. This period is ten minutes in length. The questioner is in charge and the answers must be short and definite. The chairman is the final authority in any dispute regarding the relevancy of questions, the completeness and definiteness of answers, the interpretation of the resolution, etc.

4. The first negative speaker returns to the platform and is similarly cross-questioned by the second Affirmative speaker.

5. The second negative speaker is then given ten minutes to refute the arguments of the Affirmative case and to summarize the debate for his side.

6. The second affirmative speaker is given ten minutes for similar refutation and summary.

The entire length of the debate is one hour and twenty minutes. These periods can be altered as desired but we have found them to be very satisfactory with the time allotted as above.

We have not tried this method with the three man team and rather doubt that it would be very satisfactory. Three men add too many complications which would be confusing to the average auditor and yet contribute nothing to the effectiveness of the debate.

<sup>1</sup> Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 12:175-80. April, 1926. The Oregon Plan of Debating. J. Stanley Gray.

In this method, which we have called the "Oregon Plan" for want of a better name, we have combined all the benefits of both the decision and the no-decision debate and yet we have retained none of the evils. We have no judge prejudice; no over emphasis of winning; no refusal of a debater to admit a fact because it may cause him to lose a judge's vote; no sacrificing of the welfare of the student for the sake of winning a debate; no dry academic and technical speeches; and finally, no shirking in preparation. The period of cross-questioning is sufficient stimulus for thorough preparation. Aside from the first two speeches, memorized speaking is impossible. The debater must learn to adjust himself and his ideas to the new situations which every debate presents.

We have found that the audience is always intensely interested in the periods of cross-questioning and many attend the debates just for this feature. But the entire debate is interesting because the debaters try to make it so. Wit and humor are very evident. There is no fear that a judge may be prejudiced against a good joke or an applicable story. The debate is prepared and conducted for the audience. The speeches are more popular, practical and interesting. The audience is both instructed and entertained and they come back for more.

This plan of debating is an excellent preparation for life. It requires thorough preparation, skill in keen and quick thinking, ability to make speech adjustments to unusual and unexpected situations, and the ability to establish and maintain a communicative contact with the audience. It thus accomplishes the things which we have dogmatically chosen as being the purposes, or general ends, of inter-school debating.

#### IV. INTRA-SQUAD DEBATES <sup>1</sup>

Last year the Western Reserve University debating teams conducted their fourth season of forum debates. These are discussions held between the members of the Western Reserve squad before audiences in and about Cleveland. From four to ten men participated in each of these debates, which are followed by open forum discussion. Twenty-one different men spoke in these debates, several of them appearing twelve times.

<sup>1</sup> Woodward, H. S. Forum Debating at Western Reserve. *In* Nebraska University. Seventeenth Annual Bulletin. 1926. p. 15-16.



Four questions were used: What is wrong with the American college? the tendency to extend governmental restriction of individual liberty; child labor; and government ownership of coal mines.

The groups addressed included the speakers' division of the Advertising Clubs, a number of lodges of Knights of Pythias, the Masons, and other fraternal orders, together with various church and luncheon clubs. There were twenty-eight of these debates.

At all of them a shift-of-opinion vote of the audience is taken. This serves as a decision of the debate. In nearly all cases, an alumnus debater attends as a judge on the basis of effective debating. After the debate he gives the teams privately his criticism. Last year twenty-nine debates (including a few inter-collegiate debates) were judged by both the judge or judges and the audience, the audience sentiment always being expressed by the shift-in-opinion vote. In twenty-two cases the decisions agreed. In one of the seven disagreements, the audience was tied, and in another case the vote lacked one of being a tie. In four cases of agreement, there was a split vote of the judges, the audience agreeing with a majority.

In addition to this extensive program of inter-squad debates, there were eighteen intercollegiate debates on the four questions listed above. Among the colleges were Harvard, Columbia, New York University, Washington and Jefferson, West Virginia University, Ohio Wesleyan, Wooster, Oberlin, and Notre Dame. Reserve won ten of these debates, tied two, and lost three. Two debates with Washington and Jefferson and one with Harvard were on the basis of split teams

Yet the program of intra-squad debates, with open forum features, is generally accepted at Reserve as being more valuable than the intercollegiate debating. Four years have amply proved its superiority, not only for the community, but also for the debaters themselves.

#### V. THE THREE SIDED DEBATE<sup>1</sup>

Missouri and St. Louis University were planning a debate in February on Governor Smith's proposal to modify the Prohibition laws. It seemed to me that that issue is rather dead, and I

<sup>1</sup> Gavel, 11:10-11. May, 1929. Two Experiments in Debating. Raymond F. Howes.

suggested that we make it a three-sided affair, with Washington advocating the \$24,000,000 appropriation for extra enforcement then before Congress. The arrangements were made that way, each university being represented by two men. The speeches throughout, to avoid confusion, followed the same order: Missouri, arguing for modification, Washington, arguing for more money for enforcement, and St. Louis University, upholding the status quo. We drew a crowd of between 300 and 500 people. How interesting an occasion for public discussion this would have been, I have no means of knowing, since one school insisted on having judges. But this much, at least, was made clear, that if a question has three good sides, all can be presented from the same platform without confusion and with a heightening of interest. Each team struck out right and left in rebuttal, yet managed to keep its own case clear. Perhaps there are few questions that offer three good sides. But when one does present itself, the three-sided contest is a thoroughly practicable plan for debating it.

#### VI. A DEBATING UNION<sup>1</sup>

In an effort to interest students in debating, a New England college recently founded a "debating union" which is not primarily concerned with intercollegiate debates, but from the membership of which such debaters can easily be chosen. It plans to do away with many of the evils we have mentioned, and the organization could be widely copied to advantage. Membership in the Union is open to the college community—faculty as well as students; the fee is nominal, so that no one will be deterred from joining by financial considerations. Only members have the right to sit on the floor and take part in the debate; the question is opened by two "teams" of three each, the affirmative beginning and the sides alternating until the negative closes the debate. Each speech is limited to ten minutes, after which the question is thrown open to the floor; and the debate is closed by a summing-up by the negative and affirmative leaders. The audience chooses its places on either side of a center aisle—those upholding the affirmative sitting on the chairman's right, while those supporting the negative sit on the left. When a member rises to speak, he gives his name, of which a

<sup>1</sup> School and Society. 27:770-4. June 30, 1928. On College Debating. Robert Withington.

note is made by the secretary, and future debaters are chosen from those who have spoken three times from the floor. When the debate is over, the audience leaves the hall by two doors—voting for the affirmative if they leave by the right hand one, or for the negative if they go out through that on the left; and the result is announced by the chairman after the tellers have made their report. An interesting development of this system is that one can observe how many of the audience have changed their minds during the debate, by comparing the number sitting on one side of the aisle with that leaving by the corresponding door.

Eligible speakers, by signing up for the debate, can indicate on which side of the question they care to speak. As the speakers do not represent an organization, there is no occasion for misplaced loyalty to influence judgment; and there is no need to draft speakers. The questions are of local interest, and often vital; furthermore, the results of the debate can be translated into new regulations. Let us imagine a debate on the merits of compulsory chapel attendance: one side wins an overwhelming victory, and the Student Council may immediately be called to consider a change in the regulations of the college. The non-voting public (non-members of the union) may listen to the debate from the gallery, but they may not speak; any one who wishes to do that must join the union and pay his nominal fee. Even in a short time, the interest in debating has revived enormously, and the speakers from the floor have so multiplied that there is no longer any difficulty in finding candidates for such intercollegiate debates as fill the college schedule.

### 3. INTERSCHOLASTIC DEBATING LEAGUES

#### *a. Forms of Organization*<sup>1</sup>

Originally an interscholastic debate was carried on by six students, three from each of the competing schools. There was but one contest each year, held, as a rule, alternately at each of the schools. The members of the visiting team made the journey alone, save for a faculty supervisor, and their fellow students, left behind at home, were content to hear the report next morn-

<sup>1</sup> Education. 34: 416-20. March, 1914. Group Systems in Interscholastic Debating. D. E. Watkins.

ing, except as a few ardent friends of the team waited for reports by wire.

But anything savoring of contest could not long resist taking on, in some measure, the artificial enthusiasm of athletic meets, and recognizing, in addition, the advantage always possessed by a team speaking before a friendly audience, there soon developed two annual contests, one at each school. Manifestly, under this system, it must often happen that each school would win one decision, and there would develop a tie, but principals, generally, and often the members of the team themselves, rather recoiled from attempting a third contest, with the attendant arduous preparation, so that the frequent recourse of athletic teams, "the rubber," seldom met with favor in the field of debate. Moreover, the chances for a true measure of ability, even if the third contest were indulged in, were not at all good. In each debate a new question was called for by both the debaters and the audiences, and there was always the lurking possibility that this question might not be evenly balanced. Further source of dissatisfaction was found in the fact that even two debates, with an entirely new preparation for each event, seriously taxed the energies of the students involved. So, on the whole, the practice of holding more than one interscholastic debate a year was quite generally deplored.

But Young America would not thus be arbitrarily deprived of his chance to win his spurs, and he conceived the idea of debating upon the same question with different schools, this plan possessing the advantage that he measured himself with more than one antagonist, and that he was enabled to do it without being burdened with a second long period of reading and general preparation. This feeling on the part of the debaters themselves was seconded by the policy among state universities and some small colleges of organizing state-wide leagues, where, by a system of pyramids, the championship of a whole state might be determined.

However, even this plan was soon found unsatisfactory. The series was too long, as many as seven debates being required to determine the championship of eight schools. A change of sides was often found necessary also, since two negative teams or two affirmative teams might very well happen to win in any group of four schools, and this proved to require almost as much work as was necessitated under the older plan of debating a new

question. There was still the evil attendant upon transporting large bodies of student enthusiasts, often late at night, and, while there was a gain in more thorough work on account of the supervision of higher institutions of learning, the publishing of bibliographies, and the recommendation of the study of books on the theory and art of debating, the plan, as a whole, was still found to be far from ideal.

In the meantime there had developed at the universities what is known as the "triangular" debating league, and this was at once appropriated by the high school debating interests. Large numbers of "triangles" were organized throughout the country. By this plan each school is represented by two teams, one affirmative team and one negative team. Usually all the negative teams debate away from home, since the burden of proof resting upon the affirmative is thought to be counterbalanced by the advantage of speaking before the home audience. Thus the negative team from school A (supposing the three schools in the league to be represented by A, B and C) debates the affirmative team from B at B, the negative team from B debates the affirmative team from C at C, and the negative team from C debates the affirmative team from A at A. Clearly this system is a great step in advance. Six students, instead of three, are given opportunity to show their mettle in forensic contests. The dangers of an ill-balanced question are obviated for if the question should prove one-sided, the results generally show an affirmative or negative victory all around. The debates are all held on the same evening and the championship is decided without delay. There is no transportation of large bodies of students, for each high school has enough to do in supporting its own home team. The score in victories, while usually resulting in a double victory for one school, a victory and a defeat for another, and a double defeat for the third, may, of course, stand one victory and one defeat all around, but in this case most schools decide the championship according to the number of judges' ballots won, and this puts the possibility of a draw much further off. The plan simplifies to a great degree the preparation of the various teams. There is no longer the awful dread attendant upon not knowing "what the other side will say." That is supplied by the other local team, defending the opposite side of the question. There is a very much greater chance, among young debaters, of arriving at the real issues, since the informal "combats"—and they often prove

to be just that—serve to sift pretty thoroughly the truth from the chaff. On the whole, the “triangular” plan has been found to be about the best thus far developed.

A further development of the “triangular” system is found in what has come to be known as “the Knox triple triangle” system, originated at Knox College. In this system three ordinary triangles are built into a larger triangle, nine schools being thus included in the league. The debates are conducted in a manner identical with that in use in the ordinary “triangular” formation, and the championship decided in the same way. The plan is plainly superior to any system where the elimination is accomplished by pairs, for, whereas ordinarily seven debates are necessary to determine the championship of eight schools, under this form of organization two debates decide the championship of nine schools. And this is done without any change of sides or additional preparation, something not at all certain under the older systems. So great are the advantages of this new method, that it is almost certain of adoption in larger leagues. Twenty-seven schools could unite under this plan and have the championship decided in three debates, and, if it became desirable—as it very well might under the patronage of some large state university—the championship of eighty-one schools could be determined in four debates, which is just half the number of debates required under the older system to decide the championship of sixteen schools.

Two modifications of the “triangular” formation are found in the “dual debate” and the “pentangular league.” In the “dual debate” two schools exchange teams, that is, each school has an affirmative and a negative team, and one of these visits the other school, so that two debates are held simultaneously, one in each place. The plan is better than the older one, in which each school had one team. It possesses most of the advantages of the “triangular” system, but there is a greater possibility of a tie in decisions or the number of judges’ ballots won, and, in case the championship of a larger league is being looked forward to, the process of elimination is much slower. Wherever it is difficult to secure three schools to form a league, however, the “dual” form is, without a doubt, the best. In the “pentangular” league formation five schools unite and debate in the same way as in the “triangular” system. The plan can scarcely be said to possess great advantages, however. Of course, it has the influence which

comes with numbers. It is better suited, perhaps, to universities and colleges than to high schools. There is no definite assurance that two schools will not secure the same score in decision and judges' ballots, and there are two schools in the league each year with which the other schools do not come into contest in any way. A much better plan would probably be found in a "dual triangle" formation, where the winners in two triangles—six schools—would be brought together.

*b. The University of Texas Interscholastic League  
Contests in Debate*<sup>1</sup>

Under the direction of the Bureau of Extension of the University of Texas, educational contests of various kinds are promoted in the public schools of the state. The schedule of events is as follows: Debate for Girls, Debate for Boys; Declamation Junior and Senior for Boys and Girls in the High School Division, and Declamation for Boys and Girls, Junior and Senior, Rural School Division, making eight divisions in declamation, a state championship being decided, however, in only six of these divisions, juniors in the high school divisions not being permitted to enter the state meet; extemporaneous speech, one division; music memory, two divisions, one for schools in independent districts and one for schools in common school districts; journalism, two divisions, city or town; arithmetic confined to county contests; essay writing in four divisions; spelling, and track and field athletics.

County organizations for the purpose of holding county meets to determine county winners in the above listed events are maintained in two hundred twenty-four counties, or about all of the counties in the state in which there are any schools. The teachers of the county elect the officers for conducting the county meet.

The counties are grouped into thirty-two districts for district competitions, which are conducted by district officers which are appointed by the State Executive Committee, which committee is formed of the Head of the Interscholastic League Division, Bureau of Extension, the League Athletic Director, and seven other members of the faculty of the university appointed by the President.

<sup>1</sup> Written especially for this Manual by Roy Bedichek, Head, League Division, Bureau of Extension of the University of Texas. 1924.

The county contests are held in March each year, the district contests which decide district winners in the various events are held in April, and the State Meet in which all district winners except in debate, compete, is held the first Thursday, Friday and Saturday of May, each year. All district winners except those in debate qualify for the State Meet. In both debating divisions, however, bi-district eliminations are held and only the winners of the bi-district matches are eligible to compete in the State Meet.

There is a series in most events of four contests; local, county, district and state. In both debating divisions, there is one additional contest in the series, viz., the bi-district match.

The Bureau of Extension assists schools in the following ways: 1. by maintaining the state organization; 2. providing cups, trophies and medals in all state contests; 3. preparing and publishing a bulletin outlining the question for debate; 4. preparing and circulating package libraries on the question for debate; 5. preparing and circulating through the Loan Library hundreds of declamations suitable for use in the declamation contests; 6. adjudicating disputes appealed to it from county and district committees; 7. preparing and publishing the Rules and Regulations governing the contests; also a spelling list for the spelling contests, a music memory bulletin, and a monthly paper generally promoting the contests, called *The Interscholastic League*; 8. answering correspondence relative to the work interpreting rules, etc.

More than one hundred thousand pupils in the public schools of Texas actually take part each year in one or another of these contests, which are witnessed by more than one million people.

The question for debate for the ensuing year (1924-25) is, Resolved: That the United States should grant the Philippine Islands their independence at the end of a period of five years. A bulletin of one hundred pages on this question has been prepared, and ten thousand copies will be published for distribution among the member schools.

Besides the debate bulletin, the following bulletins are issued: Constitution and Rules, Music Memory Stories, Words for the Spelling and Plain Writing Contest, *The Interscholastic Leaguer*, (eight times a year).



Schools are charged a fee, varying according to the size of the school from \$1 to \$8, and in this way about \$10,000 is collected each year, which is rebated to contestants at the state meet. This pays about 50 per cent of the railroad fare of contestants who participate in the State Meet. There were about three thousand contestants and delegates in attendance upon the last State Meet.

The League has grown from a membership of twenty-eight schools in 1911 to four thousand schools during the last season.

*c. Constitution and By-Laws of the Oregon High School  
Debating League<sup>1</sup>*

## ARTICLE I

### NAME

This organization shall be known as the Oregon High School Debating League.

## ARTICLE II

### OBJECT

The object of this league is improvement in debate among the students in the high schools of the State of Oregon.

## ARTICLE III

### MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Any public high school in Oregon may become a member of this league upon application to the executive committee of the league and shall retain its membership so long as it conforms to the constitution and by-laws.

SECTION 2. All schools seeking admission for any particular year must join by December 1 of that year.

SECTION 3. The annual dues of \$1 shall be paid to the treasurer by December 1. Failure to pay dues shall cancel membership.

<sup>1</sup> Oregon University Bulletin. Vol. XXV. No. 12. p. 14-20. December 1928.

## ARTICLE IV

## OFFICERS, COMMITTEE, DUTIES

SECTION 1. The officers of the league shall be a president and a secretary-treasurer. The president shall be elected at the annual meeting.

SECTION 2. The executive committee of the league shall consist of the president and the secretary, who shall act with the state superintendent of public instruction, the president of the University of Oregon, and the secretary of the Oregon Library Commission. This committee shall have power to increase its membership by two additional members, one of whom shall be a county superintendent.

SECTION 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the president to preside at the annual meeting, and at the final contest, and, when necessary, to call meetings of the executive committee.

(b) It shall be the duty of the secretary-treasurer to keep minutes of the annual meeting, and of the meetings of the executive committee; to disburse funds upon order of the executive committee; to collect annual dues and perform other duties pertaining to the office.

(c) It shall be the duty of the executive committee:

To pair the district champion teams, to choose sides and to make other arrangements for the inter-district contests, on the basis of convenience and least expense. The pairing and choice of sides for the inter-district and final debates shall begin before the conclusion of the district debates, and the secretary shall submit the schedule to the executive committee before it becomes final.

To cooperate with the directors, whose districts shall be represented in the final contest, in making arrangements for the contest.

To select the questions for debate.

To prepare and have printed each year, before October 1, a year book containing the latest revision of the constitution and by-laws, the list of names and addresses of the officers, statement of questions for district, inter-district and final contests, and such other matter as, in their judgment, may be helpful to the members of the league.

SECTION 4. The executive committee shall appoint for each district one director who shall be the principal (or other representative) of the league high schools in his district.

It shall be the duty of the director:

To preside at the call meetings of the principals (or other representatives) of the league high schools in his district.

To cooperate with the principals (or other representatives) of the league high schools in his district, in pairing the schools, and in making other arrangements for the several series of district contests on the basis of convenience and least expense. In case of disagreement the district director shall have final authority in pairing teams.

To file with the secretary of the league, for permanent record, and for the reference of the executive committee, not later than December 15, an approved schedule of the debates for his district. He shall report to the secretary the results of all contests immediately after they shall have been held, giving the names of the contesting schools and their representatives, together with the votes of the judges. No debate shall be considered as having been held under the auspices of the league unless the schedule shall have been filed with the secretary as above directed, and the results immediately reported.

To furnish the executive committee all other necessary information with regard to the workings of the league in his district.

## ARTICLE V

### MEETINGS, ELECTIONS

SECTION 1. The directors in the several districts shall, at any time they deem it necessary, call meetings of the principals (or other representatives) of the league high schools in their respective districts.

SECTION 2. The annual meeting shall be held at the time of the State Teachers' Association. At this meeting the officers shall be elected, each for a period of one year. Each league high school shall be entitled to only one vote.

## ARTICLE VI

### DEBATING DISTRICTS

The state shall be divided into debating districts by the executive board of the league.

## ARTICLE VII

## CONTESTS

SECTION 1. *District Contests.*—The district contests, held by teams representing the several high schools within each district, shall occur between the first of December and March 13. The team winning in the last series of these contests shall be the district champion team. The triangular system of debate is urged wherever conditions permit, leaving the method of grouping by twos in other cases. The number of debaters on the team shall be two unless a different number is agreed upon by the schools participating.

SECTION 2. *Inter-District Contests.*—The inter-district contests, held by the several district champion teams, shall occur between March 13 and May 16. The two or three teams (as the case may be) winning in these contests shall be the interdistrict champion teams.

SECTION 3. *Final Contest.*—The final contest shall be held at the University of Oregon at a time to be fixed by the executive committee.

## ARTICLE VIII

## RULES GOVERNING CONTESTS

SECTION 1. The debaters shall be undergraduate students of the schools which they represent, and shall have passing grades to date in at least three subjects that they are taking at the time of the contest.

No person over twenty-one years of age at the date of enrollment for the school year shall be eligible to represent a high school in a contest held under the auspices of the League.

SECTION 2. The team that shall represent any league high school shall be selected by a series of try outs. In cases where this seems impracticable a different method may be used when authorized by the executive committee. Without such permission the team selected in any other manner shall not be considered eligible to the district debates.

SECTION 3. At all contests the debaters shall be separated from the audience and shall receive no coaching while the debate is in progress.

SECTION 4. At all contests, in which each team shall be represented by three members, the time and order of the speeches shall be as follows:

First speaker, affirmative, 12 minutes (introduction and direct argument).

First speaker, negative, 12 minutes (direct argument and refutation).

Second speaker, affirmative, 12 minutes (direct argument and refutation).

Second speaker, negative, 12 minutes (direct argument and refutation).

Third speaker, affirmative, 12 minutes (direct argument and refutation).

Third speaker, negative, 12 minutes (direct argument and refutation).

Closer, negative, 6 minutes (rebuttal and summary).

Closer, affirmative, 6 minutes (rebuttal and summary).

NOTE: The closer on the affirmative must be the first speaker on the affirmative in order that the judges may have opportunity to grade him on rebuttal.

SECTION 5. At all contests, in which each team shall be represented by two members, the time and order of the speeches shall be as follows:

First speaker, affirmative, 15 minutes (introduction and direct argument).

First speaker, negative, 15 minutes (direct argument and refutation).

Second speaker, affirmative, 15 minutes (direct argument and refutation).

Second speaker, negative, 15 minutes (direct argument and refutation).

Closer, negative, 6 minutes (rebuttal and summary).

Closer, affirmative, 6 minutes (rebuttal and summary).

No new argument allowed in either of the last two speeches.

NOTE: The closer on the affirmative must be the first speaker on the affirmative in order that the judges may have opportunity to grade him on rebuttal.

SECTION 6. There shall be no cheering while any debater is speaking and the chairman or presiding officer shall make this announcement before the debate and shall use all means to enforce the rule. In cases of cheering, time so consumed may

be made up to the speaker at the discretion of the chairman or presiding officer.

## ARTICLE IX

### JUDGES

SECTION 1. At each contest there shall be three judges selected on the basis of capability and impartiality; and so far as possible, they shall be non-local. The principals of any two contesting schools may by mutual agreement, however, decide upon one judge to determine the issue, provided that three judges must be selected in all cases where the principals cannot agree upon one judge.

SECTION 2. The judges for inter-district debates shall be appointed by the executive committee, but in no case shall a member of said committee take part in the selection of judges in a case where he is personally interested. For the district contest, the principals of the two schools represented shall select the judges as follows: The principal of the visiting school shall submit a list of nine judges to the home school, from which to select three. If less than this number are satisfactory, the principal of the home school shall present a like list for selection, and so on until three mutually satisfactory judges are selected. The consideration of judges shall be taken up a month or more before the contest, and if possible, the final selection shall be made not less than a week before the debate.

SECTION 3. During the debate the judges shall sit apart from one another. They shall take into consideration argument, rebuttal, and effectiveness, and shall base their decisions on the merits of the debate and not on the merits of the question. Each judge at the conclusion of the contest, without consultation with any other judge, shall write on a card the word "affirmative" or "negative," seal it in an envelope, and deliver it to the presiding officer, who shall open the envelopes in sight of the two leaders, and then announce to the audience the decision.

The following score card shall be handed each judge, for his private use, and shall not be handed in with the judge's final vote:

## (FACE)

SCORE CARD FOR PRIVATE USE OF JUDGES IN  
OREGON HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING LEAGUE

(Not to be handed in with vote.)

Affirmative.	Argument.	Rebuttal.	Effectiveness.	Total.
First speaker.. .. .	.....	.....	.....	.....
Second speaker .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Third speaker.. .. .	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total .... .. .	.....	.....	.....	.....
Negative.	Argument.	Rebuttal.	Effectiveness.	Total.
First speaker.. .. .	.....	.....	.....	.....
Second speaker .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Third speaker.. .. .	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total .... .. .	.....	.....	.....	.....

N. B.—The marking shall be on a basis of 100 per cent. Not more than 100 points and not less than 60 points shall be given for each of the three divisions: Argument, Rebuttal, and Effectiveness.

## (BACK)

## INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES

- I. The judges shall sit apart from one another, and shall at the conclusion of the debate, without consultation, write on a separate card the word "affirmative" or "negative," seal in an envelope and hand to the presiding officer.
- II. Each debater shall be marked under the three heads as indicated at the bottom of the face of the score card. The affirmative shall give the final rebuttal speech, at which time the speaker will be given credit for rebuttal.
- III. Definition of terms:  
 Argument means the substance and value of the proof offered and its skilful use in the discussion.  
 Rebuttal means impromptu argument used to refute the direct argument of the opposing side.  
 Effectiveness means the combination of good English with pleasing delivery.
- IV. Decision should be based on the merits of the debate and not on the merits of the question.
- V. No judge shall under any circumstances give a consolation vote.

## ARTICLE X

## EXPENSES

SECTION 1. In all triangular and dual contests, both district and inter-district, in which each school is represented by an affirmative and a negative team, the expenses of the judges, and the hotel bills and railway mileage of the visiting teams (the three—or two, as the case may be—debaters and one member of the high school faculty) shall be pooled and borne equally by the competing schools. Immediately after each contest, each school shall submit an itemized account of its expenses to the director of the district, or some one appointed by him. The director shall add the total expenses, divide them proportionately, and make such collections and reimbursements as may be necessary to effect an equitable adjustment of expense burdens. In all contests which involve a single debate, the principals of competing schools shall mutually agree upon an equitable division of expenses. The consideration of this question shall be taken up a month or more before the contest. If a satisfactory agreement shall not have been reached at least two weeks before the contest, the question shall be referred to the district director for final adjustment and settlement. In case the schools of any district may be able to agree upon some other more satisfactory system, they shall not be bound by this section in their intra-district contests.

SECTION 2. Whenever two competing teams may find it more convenient or less expensive to meet at some halfway point, the two schools represented by these teams shall share equally the expense, or make some special arrangements for defraying the expenses of that particular debate.

SECTION 3. At the final contest the university shall pay the expenses of the judges and the hotel bills and traveling expenses of the two teams.

NOTE: When the above section was incorporated in the constitution, the final debate involved only the two teams which were the winners in the inter-district contests. It should therefore be understood that the University does not necessarily agree to pay the traveling expenses of teams when any other plan of deciding the final championship of the state is followed.

## ARTICLE XI

## AMENDMENTS

This constitution and by-laws may be amended at any annual meeting by a majority of the league high schools present. But



no school shall have more than one vote. Amendments may also be made at any time by majority vote of the executive committee, subject to ratification at the next annual meeting.

### BY-LAWS

1. It shall be considered improper to entertain judges before the contest at any place other than the hotel.

2. It shall be considered dishonorable for any school to visit the debates of another school when these two schools are likely to meet on the same question.

3. It shall be considered dishonorable for any debater, in any manner, to plagiarize his speech.

4. The state championship cup shall become the permanent property of the school winning it three times.

5. Each school shall appoint a timekeeper. The two timekeepers shall sit directly in front of the speakers, and shall enforce the time limit and shall give such warning as the leader of each team shall direct.

6. *Procedure in Protests and Appeals.* All protests and appeals shall be made in writing and shall be signed by the official representative of the school protesting or appealing and accompanied by evidence to substantiate the claim made, and filed with the secretary of the league. The school against whom the protest or appeal is made shall have an opportunity to see a copy of the protest or appeal, and within five days submit a statement in reply, copy of which shall be sent to the protesting school. Upon evidence and statement thus submitted and upon such other information as it may have before it, or may gather, the executive committee shall decide the appeal by the procedure following: The secretary shall furnish identical copies of the documents in the case to the several members of the committee, asking from each his vote on the question at issue.

#### *d. Model Contract for a Triangular League*<sup>1</sup>

In order to assist those high schools which may contemplate forming triangular leagues, the following contract used by the University of Washington in its triangular leagues is set forth in full. It covers all of the essential points and may be adapted to suit the needs of any triangular league, either of high schools or of non-scholastic organizations.

<sup>1</sup>Jones, L. *Manual for Debaters*. p. 22-6. Univ. of Wash. 1913.

## ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT

## ARTICLE I.—ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. There is hereby created a Triangular Debating League, consisting of the University (high school or club, of A, University of B, and University of C.

SECTION 2. There shall be a secretary of the league who shall conduct its correspondence. For the school year of 1913-1914, the University of C shall appoint the secretary; the University of B shall have the appointment the second year; and the University of A for the third year; and so continuing.

## ARTICLE II.—CHOOSING THE QUESTION

SECTION 1. On October first each institution shall submit one general subject for debate to the secretary, who shall on receipt of them send the subjects so submitted to each institution. Each university shall mark the subjects in the order in which they are preferred, 1, 2, 3, and return by October 10th to the secretary, who shall compute the vote, allowing one credit for each first choice, two for each second choice, and three for each third choice. The subject receiving the least number of credits shall be the one for framing into the question for debate.

SECTION 2. In case no general subject receives a plurality of credits, the secretary shall choose the subject for debate; but he shall not choose the subject submitted by the institution he represents.

SECTION 3. On or before October 15th the secretary shall submit the subject so chosen to each institution in the league; and on October 25th each institution shall mail to the secretary the wording of such subject into a question for debate which is most approved by such institution.

SECTION 4. Upon receipt of these questions the secretary shall mail to each institution the three questions so formed; and each institution shall vote as follows: First, for the question most preferred for debate; second, for the question preferred second; third, for the question preferred third. Credits shall be allowed the same as in choosing the general subject.

SECTION 5. The vote shall be returned at once to the secretary and the question receiving the least number of credits shall be the one used in the debate. In case no question receives a

plurality of credits the question shall be chosen in the same manner as the general subject.

SECTION 6. The question shall be chosen and submitted to each institution not later than November 5.

### ARTICLE III.—TEAMS

SECTION 1. Each institution shall have two teams which shall support the opposite sides of the question.

SECTION 2. The affirmative team shall remain at home and the negative team shall go abroad.

SECTION 3. Each team shall consist of two members, but no one shall be chosen who is not a regularly matriculated undergraduate student doing full work, matriculated at least three months previous to the date of the debate.

SECTION 4. At least three weeks before the debate the president of each university shall send to the other universities statements of eligibility of the debaters.

### ARTICLE IV.—THE CONTEST

SECTION 1. The schedule of debates shall be as follows:

#### 1913

University of A vs. University of B at University of B.

University of B vs. University of C at University of C.

University of A vs. University of C at University of A.

#### 1914

University of B vs. University of C at University of B.

University of A vs. University of C at University of C.

University of A vs. University of B at University of A.

And they shall so alternate in after years.

SECTION 2. The date of the contest shall be mutually agreed upon each year.

SECTION 3. Each debater shall be allowed two speeches—a main speech of twenty minutes' duration and a rebuttal speech of five minutes' duration. The order of speeches in the debate shall be as follows:

Main speeches.	Rebuttal speeches
1. First affirmative.	5. Negative.
2. First negative.	6. Affirmative.
3. Second affirmative.	7. Negative.
4. Second negative.	8. Affirmative.

The order of speaking in the rebuttal speeches need not be fixed, but may be changed at any time by either team; but the negative shall always give the first rebuttal speech and the affirmative the last rebuttal speech.

SECTION 4. The use of charts and personal correspondence on the platform is prohibited.

#### ARTICLE V.—TIMEKEEPERS

There shall be two timekeepers, one appointed by each team, whose duty it shall be to enforce the time limits and give such further signals as each team shall direct.

#### ARTICLE VI.—PRESIDENT OF THE EVENING

The president of the evening shall be appointed by the university holding the debate. He shall preside over the debate, give instructions to the judges, and announce the decision of the judges.

#### ARTICLE VII.—THE JUDGES

SECTION 1. The debate shall be judged and decided by three judges, who shall be disinterested persons not notoriously prejudiced on the question under discussion, not in any way related to the contestants, and not holding a degree from either institution or connected therewith in any relation.

SECTION 2. They shall be chosen as follows: At least six weeks before the debate the visiting university shall nominate to the university holding the debate twelve (12) persons to act as judges, of whom the latter university shall secure any three to act. The university holding the debate shall always be privileged to reject any nominee without assigning any cause, and immediately upon rejecting any names on the list, shall notify the other university of those thus rejected. Meanwhile the university holding the debate shall attempt to secure as judges any three of those not rejected, and, in case of inability to secure the three, shall attempt to secure the others from the new names presented. The university holding the debate may at any time reject any names on the lists, the visiting university always filling up the number to twelve. This process shall be continued until three judges are secured.

## ARTICLE VIII.—INSTRUCTION TO JUDGES

A card shall be handed to each judge by the presiding officer with the following instructions in typewritten form:

"The judges shall consider both thought and delivery; but it is agreed that matter is more important than form.

"Each judge shall decide in his own way what constitutes effective debating.

"The award shall be made on the merits of the arguments as presented in the debate, and not upon the merits of the question itself.

"Each judge shall vote 'affirmative' or 'negative' without consultation. The votes shall be signed, sealed, and delivered to the presiding officer, who shall open them and announce the decision."

## ARTICLE IX.—CHAMPIONSHIPS

SECTION 1. Immediately following the contest, the signed verdicts of the judges shall be sent to the secretary, who shall determine the winner and notify the three institutions represented.

SECTION 2. Championships are to be decided by summing up the votes and the victories. Each victory shall count as one unit and each vote as one unit, and the institution receiving the highest number of units shall be the champion.

## ARTICLE X.—EXPENSES

SECTION 1. The university under whose auspices the debate is held shall have charge of all local arrangements and shall assume all financial obligation thereof, including the expenses of the judges, and the following expenses of the visiting team: Hotel expenses for a period not exceeding two days; but not including the mileage proper, or expenses for berths and meals en route.

SECTION 2. Within a week after the date of the debate each institution shall send to the secretary a statement of its team's mileage expenses and expenses of berths and meals en route, which shall be pooled by the secretary and divided equally between the three institutions.

## ARTICLE XI.—CORRESPONDENCE

All correspondence relative to the question and the judges shall be carried on by special delivery letter.

## ARTICLE XII.—AMENDMENTS

These articles may be amended with the consent of any two of the institutions represented.

These articles shall be drawn up and signed in triplicate and one copy shall be held by each university.

For the University of A  
(Signed) .....  
For the University of B  
(Signed) .....  
For the University of C  
(Signed) .....

*e. Contract for a Pentangular League*

A constitution or contract for a debating league of five institutions can be modeled for the most part on the contract for a triangular league just preceding. There are several particulars, however, in which it would be necessary to change the form of contract, as follows:

For Article I, section 2, may be substituted the following: Each university shall create a debating board consisting of from one to three members, the majority of which should be chosen from the faculty. One man should be selected from the board to serve as a secretary for the school. These five secretaries shall conduct the correspondence of the league.

## ARTICLE IV.—THE CONTEST

It is undesirable for each of the five schools to meet more than two of the other schools of the league in the same year. In order that each school may be given an opportunity to meet each of the other schools in turn, a schedule may be arranged to cover four years as follows:

## FIRST YEAR:

University of A vs. University of C at University of C  
University of B vs. University of D at University of D  
University of C vs. University of E at University of E  
University of D vs. University of B at University of B  
University of E vs. University of A at University of A

## SECOND YEAR:

University of A vs. University of E at University of E  
University of B vs. University of A at University of A

University of C vs. University of B at University of B  
 University of D vs. University of C at University of C  
 University of E vs. University of D at University of D

### THIRD YEAR:

University of A vs. University of B at University of B  
 University of B vs. University of E at University of E  
 University of C vs. University of A at University of A  
 University of D vs. University of B at University of B  
 University of E vs. University of C at University of C

### FOURTH YEAR:

University of A vs. University of B at University of B  
 University of B vs. University of C at University of C  
 University of C vs. University of D at University of D  
 University of D vs. University of E at University of E  
 University of E vs. University of A at University of A

## ARTICLE VII.—THE JUDGES

The following is a copy of Article V of the constitution of the Central Debating League of America, in its contests from 1906 to 1914 inclusive:

### *Contests for 1906-1907 and 1910-1911*

CONTESTING STATES	PLACE OF CONTEST	RESIDENCE OF JUDGE
Minnesota	Iowa City . . . . .	Illinois
Iowa		Nebraska
Nebraska	Urbana . . . . .	Iowa
Illinois		Wisconsin
Iowa	Madison . . . . .	Illinois
Wisconsin		Minnesota
Illinois	Minneapolis . . . . .	Iowa
Minnesota		Wisconsin
Wisconsin	Lincoln . . . . .	Iowa
Nebraska		

*Contests for 1907-1908 and 1911-1912*

Illinois	{	..... Iowa City .....	{	Minnesota
Iowa				Nebraska
Wisconsin				
	{	..... Urbana .....	{	Iowa
Illinois				
Minnesota				
	{	..... Madison .....	{	Illinois
Wisconsin				Iowa
Nebraska				
	{	..... Minneapolis .....	{	Wisconsin
Minnesota				
Iowa				
	{	..... Lincoln .....	{	Minnesota
Nebraska				

*Contests for 1908-1909 and 1912-1913*

Wisconsin	{	..... Iowa City .....	{	Illinois
Iowa				Nebraska
Minnesota				Wisconsin
	{	..... Urbana .....	{	Iowa
Illinois				Illinois
Nebraska				
	{	..... Madison .....	{	Minnesota
Wisconsin				Wisconsin
Iowa				
	{	..... Minneapolis .....	{	Nebraska
Minnesota				
Illinois				
	{	..... Lincoln .....	{	Iowa
Nebraska				

*Contests for 1909-1910 and 1913-1914*

Nebraska	{	..... Iowa City .....	{	Minnesota
Iowa				Illinois
Iowa				
	{	..... Urbana .....	{	Wisconsin
Illinois				



Illinois	{	..... Madison .....	{	Minnesota
Wisconsin				
Wisconsin	{	..... Minneapolis .....	{	Nebraska
Minnesota				
Minnesota	{	..... Lincoln .....	{	Iowa
Nebraska				

On April 1 each university shall submit judges according to the above schedule.

When a single state furnishes the judges for any contest it shall submit a list of twenty-four names to each of the two competing universities. These lists shall be duplicates.

When two states furnish the judges they shall each submit a list of twelve names.

When a state furnishes judges for two or more contests it shall make up its several lists as impartially as possible with reference to the distribution of able men.

Convenience and economy for the attending judges shall be a factor in their nomination in so far as may be consistent with the choice of able men.

Not later than October 1 preceding the contest the visiting university shall send to the entertaining university a list of six candidates for judges chosen from the proper rolls. Not later than the same date the entertaining university shall send to its opponent a list of the twelve judges chosen from the proper rolls. Each university shall arrange the opponent's list of candidates in the order of its choice.

Each university shall have the right to challenge any or all of the number of the candidates submitted by its opponent on presentation of good and sufficient reason. The challenge list, together with objections, shall be returned at once to the sender. The list shall be completed and re-submitted not later than October 20th.

It is further understood that any person recommended for judge who is a relative, actual or prospective, of any contestant, or who is an alumnus of either university, or who holds or has held any official relation with either university may be rejected.

The secretary of the entertaining university shall notify the judges by a joint note, the form of which shall be as follows:

The state universities of ..... and .....  
will hold a joint debate at ..... on .....  
The specific wording of the proposition for debate is: Resolved,  
That, etc.

We shall consider ourselves especially favored if you can be with us at.....to hear and judge this contest. (Insert a sentence here stating the names of the other judges who have been invited or who have consented to serve.)

We shall of course meet your entire expense. Trusting that we may have an early and favorable reply, we remain,

Respectfully yours,.....

A. B., University of.....

C. D., University of.....

The entertaining university shall sign the names of both secretaries to the letter and shall enclose a stamped envelope addressed to each for the reply.

Before the contest the judges shall be entertained at a hotel and every semblance of an effort to influence them will be regarded as dishonorable conduct.

The secretary will secure two judges from the list of the entertaining university and one from the list of the opponent adhering strictly to the order recommended by the respective universities. But if any name or names should be found on both lists they shall be first invited to serve.

The university submitting a list of names shall always report on the qualifications of the judges in the following respects: I. Occupation. II. Where educated. III. Politics. IV. Religion. V. Official relations with any university of the league at any time.



## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON PUBLIC SPEAKING, ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE

##### BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Nichols, Egbert Ray. *Intercollegiate Debates: Year Book of College Debating with Records of Questions and Decisions, Specimen Speeches and Bibliographies. Volumes II and IV.* \$2.50 ea. Hinds, Noble & Eldredge.

See Volume II, Appendix IV, also Volume IV, Appendix V, for list of references on argumentation and debate.

O'Neill, James M. and others. *Argumentation and Debate.* \$2.20. p. 445-8. Bibliography. Macmillan. 1917.

Pittsburgh. Carnegie Library. *Debate Index.* 3d ed. 30c; post-paid 35c. 1919.

This third edition replaces all earlier editions, including the second edition published in 1912, and the First, Second and Third Supplements, covering 1912-1913, 1913-1915, and 1916-1917 respectively.

Robbins, E. C. *High School Debate Book.* new and rev. ed. \$1.50. McClurg & Co. Chicago. 1923.

Appendix B: List of Debatable Questions Upon Which the Library of Congress Has Issued Bibliographies.

Teachers College Record. 28:1027-34. Je. '27. *Debating. Bibliography.* E. K. Fretwell.

##### BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Arnold, John H. *Debaters' Guide.* rev. and enl. \$2. Handy Book Corporation. Harrisburg, Pa. 1923.

Babcock, Robert Weston and Powell, John Henderson, jr. *How to Debate.* 288p. Lippincott. Phila. 1923.

Baird, Albert Craig. *Public Discussion and Debate.* 370p. \$1.92. Ginn & Co. Boston. 1928.

This book restates clearly the familiar argumentative principles in terms of present-day speech, logic and psychology, with much illustrative material chosen from present-day models.

Baker, George Pierce and Huntington, Henry B. Principles of Argumentation. rev. and enl. ed. \$2.20. Ginn & Co. 1925.

Borden, Richard C. and Busse, Alvin C. How to Win an Argument. 166p. \$2. Harper. N. Y. 1926.

A book which, while primarily for business executives and salesmen, may be of use to teachers of college debate also. With many dialogues and exercises.

Collins, George and Morris, John S. Persuasion and Debate. 276p. \$2. Harper. N. Y. 1927.

This book deals with the application of psychological principles to informal persuasion and formal debating.

Covington, H. F. Fundamentals of Debate. \*\$1.50. Scribner. 1918.

Craig, Asa H. and Edgerton, Alice C. Both Sides of 30 Public Questions Completely Debated (Pros and Cons): with By-Laws and Parliamentary Laws for Conducting Debating Societies and a List of Interesting Topics for Debate. rev. ed. 563p. \$2.25. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1926.

p. 1-11. How to organize a debating society; p. 12-14. Rules covering debates.

Cromwell, E. G. Compendium of Parliamentary Law. rev. ed. 212p. \$1. Laird & Lee. Chicago. 1925.

Davis, Henry C. and Smith, Reed. Debating for High Schools. (South Carolina University. Extension Department. Bulletin. No. 83. February, 1920.)

Denney, Joseph Villiers, Duncan, Carson S. and McKinney, Frank C. Argumentation and Debate. \*\$1.60. American Book Co. 1910.

Elliott, Harrison Sackett. Process of Group Discussion. \$3. Assn. Press.

Esenwein, J. Berg. How to Attract and Hold an Audience. rev. & enl. \$1.50. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1928.

Fort, L. M. Argumentation and Debate. \$1.50. Educator Supply Co. Mitchell, S. D. 1925.

Fort, L. M. Oral English and Debate. \$1. Henry Holt & Co. N. Y. 1929.

Foster, William Trufant. Argumentation and Debating. Revised ed. \*\$2. Houghton Mifflin. Boston. 1917.

Foster, William Trufant. Essentials of Exposition and Argument. \$1.60. Houghton Mifflin. Boston. 1911.

Gislason, Haldor B. Effective Debating. 55p. pa. Free in Minnesota, outside 15c. (Minnesota. University. Bulletin. Gen. Ser. No. 14. April, 1914.) Out of print.

Graves, Harold F. and Spotts, Carle B. *The Art of Argument*. 298p. \$2.50. Prentice-Hall. N. Y. 1927.

See especially Part III. Contest Debating, and Appendix: Works of reference.

Hassell, Kate and Raub, Berta. *Beginner's Book of the Correct Practice of Parliamentary Law*. \$1. Southwest Press. Dallas, Texas.

Henry, W. H. F. and Seeley, Levi. *How to Organize and How to Conduct a Meeting*. \$1.50. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1926.

A complete treatise on parliamentary law simplified for use in schools and colleges.

Hicks, Philip M. *New Spirit in Debating*. (*In* Drummond, Alexander M. ed. and comp. *A Course of Study in Speech Training and Public Speaking for Secondary Schools; Being the Report of a Special Committee of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, with a Series of Special Articles*. p. 174-80. \$1.25. Century. N. Y. 1925.)

Howe, F. W. *Handbook of Parliamentary Usage*. \$1. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1904.

Immel, Ray K. and Whipple, Ruth H. *Debating for High Schools*. vii, 251p. \$1.36. Ginn & Co. N. Y. 1929.

Jones, Leo. *Manual for Debaters*. 81p. pa. 15c. (Washington (State). University. Bulletin. Gen. Ser. No. 75. Exten. Ser. No. 8. August, 1913.) Out of print.

Kansas. University. Extension Division. Bulletin. Vol. 26. No. 8. April 15, 1925. High School Debating League. Announcement for 1915-1916.

Contents: p. 22-7. "How to Judge a Debate," by Rollo L. Lyman. Constitution and by-laws of the League. p. 34-8.

Ketcham, Victor Alvin. *Theory and Practice of Argumentation and Debate*. \$2. Macmillan. 1914.

Kleiser, Grenville. *How to Argue and Win*. \$1.60. Funk & Wagnalls. 1911.

Kleiser, Grenville. *How to Speak in Public*. \$1.60. Funk & Wagnalls.

Kleiser, Grenville, comp. *Kleiser's Complete Guide to Public Speaking*. \$6.00. Funk & Wagnalls. 1915.

"Comprising extracts from the world's greatest authorities upon public speaking, oratory, preaching, platform and pulpit delivery, voice building and management, argumentation, debate, reading, rhetoric, expression, gesture, composition, etc."—Title page.

Laycock, Craven and Spofford, A. K. *Manual of Argumentation for High Schools and Academies*. 80c. Macmillan. N. Y. 1913.

Lee, Joshua Bryan. Public Speaking Manual. (Part III, Ex-tempore Speaking and Debate). Harlow Pub. Co Oklahoma City. 1924.

Leighton, Frederick. Students' Handbook of Parliamentary Law. 25c. The Author. Oswego, N. Y. 1926.

Lyon, Leverett S. Elements of Debating. \$1.25. Univ. of Chicago Press. 1913.

McGee, John A. Persuasive Speaking. \$1.60. Scribner. N. Y. 1929.

It contains a detailed analysis of the motives of human action and describes the steps thru which the speaker must conduct the minds of his listeners in order to secure the desired result.

Macpherson, William. Psychology of Persuasion. \$2.50. Dutton. New York.

Michigan. University. Extension Division. Michigan High School Debating League, 1921-1922. (University Bulletin, n.s. Vol. xxiii. No. 6. August 6, 1921).

p. 8-10. Ethics of debate.

p. 16-20. Constitution of the Michigan High School Debating League.

Montana. University. Bulletin. State Univ. Series. No. 299. August, 1928. p. 12-15. Constitution and By-laws of the Montana High School Debating League; p. 15-16. Instrucons to Judges.

Mosher, Joseph A. Complete Course in Public Speaking. \$2.25. Macmillan. N. Y. 1924.

This is a new edition of Mosher's Effective Public Speaking: Essentials of Extempore Speaking and of Gesture, published in 1917 and now out of print.

Nichols, Ray Egbert. Intercollegiate Debates: Year Book of College Debating with Records of Questions and Decisions, Specimen Speeches and Bibliographies. Volumes II-VII. \$2.50 ea. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1909-1917.

For a discussion of the value and methods of debate see the Introduction in each volume. See also Appendices for Lists of Debating Organizations; Lists of Questions Debated; Specimen Contracts and Agreements and Constitutions for Debating Organizations; Bibliographies.

Nichols, Ray Egbert. Intercollegiate Debates: A Year Book of College Debating. Volumes VIII-IX. \$2.50 ea. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1927-1928.

The editor's foreword contains some interesting observations on contemporary debating. Each volume contains complete indexes for the series.

Oklahoma. University. Extension Division: Department of Public Discussion and Debate. Debate Bulletin. No. 12. Student's Manual of Debating and Parliamentary Practice. 64p. pa.

Largely a reprint of three bulletins "Principles of Effective Debating," "How to Judge a Debate," and "Debating Societies: Organization and Procedure," written by Rollo L. Lyman and issued by the University of Wisconsin.

- O'Neill, James M. *Debating Societies: Organization and Procedure.* (Univ. Exten. Div. Dept. of Debating. Bull. Ser. no. 1338, Gen. Ser. no. 1115.) pa. 25c Univ. of Wisconsin Press. Madison. 1925.
- O'Neill, James M. *Manual of Debate and Oral Discussion.* \$1.50. Century. 1920.
- O'Neill, James M. *Principles of Effective Debating and How to Judge a Debate.* (Univ. Exten. Div. Dept. of Debating. Bull. Serial No. 1337; Gen. Ser. No. 1114) 58p. pa. 35c. Univ. of Wisconsin Press. Madison. 1925.
- O'Neill, James M. and others. *Argumentation and Debate.* \$2.10. Macmillan. 1917.
- This volume is the result of a complete re-writing of "Argumentation and Debate" as published by Laycock and Scales in 1904.
- Overstreet, Harry A. *Influencing Human Behavior.* People's Institute Pub. Co. N. Y. 1925.
- "Professor Overstreet, perhaps without intending to do so, has written an excellent text on persuasive speaking."—*W. P. Sandford.*
- Palmer, Edmond. *New Parliamentary Manual; a Guide for Deliberative Bodies, and a Text Book for High Schools and Colleges.* 276p. \$1. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1927.
- Pattee, George K. *Practical Argumentation.* rev. ed. \$1.75. Century. 1917.
- Contains a chapter on parliamentary procedure.
- Pearson, Paul M. *Intercollegiate Debates: Being Briefs and Reports of Many Intercollegiate Debates.* \$2.50. Noble and Noble. N. Y.. 1909.
- See introduction p. vii-xxix.
- Pearson, Paul. M. and Hicks, Philip M. *Extemporaneous Speaking.* \$2. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1912.
- Perry, Frances M. *Introductory Course in Argumentation.* \$1.20. American Book Co. 1906.
- Reeves, J. Walter. *Fundamentals of Argumentation and Debate.* 60c. rev. ed. D. C. Heath & Co. Boston. 1928.
- A short treatise for high schools, debating clubs and societies, and for short courses in the freshman year of college.
- Ringwalt, Ralph Curtis. *Brief Drawing.* \$1.50. Longmans. New York. 1923.
- Robbins, E. C. *High School Debate Book.* new and rev. ed. \$1.50. A. C. McClurg & Co. 1923.
- See p. 1-30; also Appendix A: Model Constitution for a Literary Society.
- Robert, Henry M. *Rules of Order Revised for Deliberative Assemblies.* \$1.50; lea. \$2. Scott, Foresman & Co. Chicago. 1915.



Robert, Joseph Thomas. *Primer of Parliamentary Law*. 264p. \$1. Doubleday, Doran. Garden City, N. Y. 1923.

Scott, W. D. *Psychology of Public Speaking*. \*\$1.60. Noble and Noble. 1907.

Shurter, Edwin DuBois. *Public Speaking: A Treatise on Delivery*. new ed. 176p \$1.20. Allyn & Bacon. Boston. 1927.

A thorough revision of the earlier book of this title. Includes a great many selections, exercises and illustrations.

Shurter, Edwin DuBois. *Science and Art of Effective Debating; a Textbook for High Schools and Colleges*. 322p. \$2. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1925.

Covers the subject of argumentation in all its phases.

Shurter, Edwin DuBois and Marsh, Charles A. *Practical Speech Making*. \$1.60. Houghton Mifflin. Boston, 1929.

Sims, John Green, jr. *Debating as an Educator*. 112p. \$1.50; pa. 75c. The Author. Box 652. Fort Worth, Texas. 1926.

*Suggestions on Debating*. 31p. 30c. *Debaters Research*. Baylor Univ. Waco, Texas. 1926.

Texas. University. *Bulletin*. No. 2822. June 8, 1928. *University Interscholastic League: Constitution and Rules*.

Constitution and rules of the League, p. 9-29; Rules in public speaking and debate, p. 30-9.

Thomas, Ralph W. *Manual of Debate*. p. 11-160. \$1. American Book Co. 1910.

Whitney, Byrle A. *Parliamentary Guide and Practical Chart, Especially Adapted for Ready Reference*. 90p. \$1. Lyons & Carnahan. Chicago. 1926.

Wicks, Sidney F. *Public Speaking for Business Men*. \$2.25. Stokes. N. Y. 1925.

Chap. XIV. *The Art of Debate*.

#### MAGAZINE ARTICLES

*American Magazine*. 96:32-3+. S. '23. *This Tiny College Has Beaten the World at Debating*. Rex Stuart.

*Century*. 82:937-42. O. '11. *College Debating*. Rollo L. Lyman. *Education*. 34:162-8. N. '13. *Solution for Public Speaking in the High School*. C. T. Mauller.

Proposes a plan of extemporaneous speeches as a substitute for debate.

*Education*. 34:416-20. Mr. '14. *Group Systems in Interscholastic Debating*. Dwight E. Watkins.

Describes the dual, triangular and pentangular forms of debating leagues.

Education. 37:160-6. N. '16. Debating Problems in High School and College. Myra A. Smith.

Education. 42:39-42. S. '21. Academic Debate: Its Aim and Method. William A. Wetzel.

A criticism of academic debating as ordinarily conducted.

Education. 42:339-42. F. '22. Academic Debate, Its Aims and Method: Reply to William A. Wetzel. Clarence S. Dike.

Educational Review. 70:24-5. Je. '25. Cost of Debating. Alzada Comstock.

Educational Review. 72:222-5. N. '26. Debate as Training for Citizenship; reply to A. Comstock. William N. Brigance.

Educational Review. 74:155-61. O. '27. Mind-Bedevelopment Caused by Debates. Vernon L. Mangun.

Educational Review. 74:195-200. N. '27. Debating: Sophism Institutionalized. Vernon L. Mangun.

He describes the dangers in traditional methods of debating and the need of newer ways that will not emphasize so strongly the idea of rivalry as a leading motive, and which will lead the student to argue from conviction rather than to gain a given end.

English Journal. 2:389-90. Je. '13. Work in Debates.

Describes work in debate actually done in one class in the Deerfield Township High School, Highland Park, Ill.

English Journal. 3:94-8. F. '14. Appreciation and Management of High School Debate. Alvah T. Otis.

English Journal. 4:15-20. Ja. '15. New Idea in High-School Discussion Contests. Ross F. Lockridge.

English Journal. 4:577-81. N. '15. Debating in the College Curriculum. Victor O. Freeburg.

English Journal. 6:108-10. F. '17. New Plan for High-School Debating in Montana. George R. Coffman.

English Journal. 8:602-9. D. '19. Some Types of Public Speaking. Leverett S. Lyon.

A plea for more "motivated extempore speaking."

English Journal. 9:147-52. Mr. '20. Game of Debate. E. B. Richards.

How interclass debates were used in one school to develop increasing interest and proficiency in oral work.

English Journal. 9:212-18. Ap. '20. Reorganization of Methods of Debate in High Schools. Thomas W. Gosling.

Cites some of the objections to debating as now carried on and offers some suggestions for improvement.

English Journal. 11:293-6. My. '22. Discussion Contest. Julia E. Gettemy.

English Journal. 16:203-12. Mr. '27. Shall the Audience Decide? Edmund T. Becher.

He sets forth the advantages of having the debate judged by vote of the audience before and after, as opposed to a decision by one or more appointed judges, or to debates where no decisions are rendered.

English Journal (College Edition) 18:320-9. Ap. '29. Recent Trend in Debating. Henry Adelbert White.

Gavel. 10:7-9. N. '27. Intra-Squad Public Debating at Western Reserve. W. A. D. Millson.

Gavel. 10:10. N. '27. Some Objections against Judged Debates. William Schrier.

Gavel. 10:11-13. N. '27. Debating for the Audience. Harrison B. Summers.

Gavel. 11:10-13. Ja. '29. Financing Intercollegiate Forensics. W. Arthur Cable.

Gavel. 11:14. Ja. '29. No-Decision Debates. Ewald T. Grether.

Gavel. 11:15-16. Ja. '29. Debating Standards. Donald Hayworth.

Gavel. 11:16-19. Ja. '29. Management of Debate. H. Adelbert White.

A summary, by states, of replies to a questionnaire sent out by the author "to the Extension Division of every State in the Union to determine the methods of conducting high school debating."

Gavel. 11:8-9. My. '29. Pittsburgh Policy in Debating. W. M. Parrish.

Gavel. 11:10-11. My. '29. Two Experiments in Debating. Raymond F. Howes.

Journal of Education. 83:319-20. Mr. 23, '16. Evils of Themes and Debating. Robert Hale.

Journal of the National Education Association. 13:106. Mr. '24. How Shall Debates Be Judged. Caspar Harvey.

Journal of The National Education Association. 13:301. N. '24. Why Should Debates Be Judged? Reply to P. C. Harvey. Walter W. Parker.

An argument for no decision debates or for decision by vote of the audience.

New Republic. 33:94-7. D. 20, '22. Reason and the "fight-image." H. A. Overstreet.

New Student. 8:7-9. Ap. '29. Can Debating Survive? J. Mack Swigert.

Nor'-West Farmer. 39:1533-4. N. 20, '20. Organizing a Debating Society in a Country Community. T. D. Hunt.

Outlook. 132:55-6. S. 13, '22. Where Men Debate Beliefs—not Statistics. George L. Moore.

- Outlook. 132:281-2. O. 18, '22. World's Greatest Debating Society. Ralph M. Carson.
- Outlook. 132:354. N. 1, '22. Reality of Debating. Lincoln L. Kellogg.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 4:76-92. Ja. '18. Judging Debates. H. N. Wells.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 4:116-18. Ja. '18. Delivery in Debate. Charles F. Lindsay.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 4:160-9. Mr. '18. Argumentation and Debate in High Schools. Andrew T. Weaver.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 4:263-70. My. '18. Coaching Debates. H. N. Wells.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 4:263-70. My. '18. Ways and Means of Getting a Student Before a Real Audience. H. B. Gislason.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 4:398-433. O. '18. Jurymen or Critics; Three Rebuttal Arguments and a Decision. H. M. Wells; J. M. O'Neill; L. R. Sarett.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 5:101-19. Mr. '19. Persuasion: Principles and Method. Charles H. Woolbert.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 6:69-72. Ap. '20. Emancipation of the Contest Coach. Nona Macquillin.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 7:149-57. Ap. '21. Graphic Interpretation of the Proposition for Debate. Adolph H. Brick.
- Selecting the proposition for debate.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 7:261-71. Je. '21. Problems in Teaching Debate. G. Rowland Collins.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 7:279-91. Je. '21. Decisionless Debate with the Open Forum.
- Recounts the experiences of six mid-western universities in conducting debates without judges.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 8:138-44. Ap. '22. Crime against Public Speaking. Warren Choate Shaw.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 8:181-3. Ap. '22. Measuring the Reaction of the Audience to an Argumentative Speech. William E. Utterbach.
- Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 9:195-6. Ap. '23. A Ray of Hope as to Judges. William Hawley Davis.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 9:215-22. Je. '23.  
Shall American Universities Adopt the British System of Debating? A. Craig Baird. (Reprinted in the Wilson Bulletin for February, 1924. p. 179-83.)

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 9:286-9. Je. '23. Financing Forensics. J. C. Hazzard.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:127-43. Ap. '24. Debate Coaching in High School—Benefits and Methods. Ruth E. Huston.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:332-9. N. '24. Debate and the World We Live in. Joseph A. Mosher.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:340-5. N. '24. Two Years of Open Forum Debating at Swarthmore. Philip M. Hicks.

Describes and defines the open-forum debate and the results of its trial for two years at Swarthmore.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:346-9. N. '24. On the Open Forum. C. L. Menser.

Describes certain defects in the open-forum system of debating that in his opinion should be corrected.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11:45-8. F. '25. American and English Debating. Raymond F. Howes.

His contention is that the fundamental difference between the English and American debater is the former's attitude of open-mindedness which must be cultivated in the American debates if the Oxford system is to succeed in this country.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11:118-19. Ap. '25. Argumentation and Debate: Course; a Summary of the Report of the Syllabus Committee Proposing a Course in Speech Training and Public Speaking for Secondary Schools. A. M. Drummond.

This report was approved and adopted by the National Association of Teachers of Speech, at Evanston, Ill. December 31, 1924.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11:130-5. Ap. '25. Debating for Every Pupil. I. D. Perry.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11:135-9. Ap. '25. The Modern High School Debating Society. Ruth E. Huston.

She describes the "Lister" high school debating society in Detroit Michigan.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11:150-7. Ap. '25. Skill in Debate. Emerson W. Miller.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11:286-8. Je. '25. On Critic Debate Decisions. C. H. Woolbert.

He argues for the value to the audience in having the critic judge to discuss the debate before them. Audiences need training in how to listen to debates.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11:319-37. N. '25. Natural Procedure in Argument. Gladys M. Graham. Discussion. 12:66-8, 196-7. F.-Ap. '26.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11:364-8. N. '25. Finding Debate Audiences. Raymond F. Howes.

If the audience will not come to this debate, take the debate to the audience is Mr. Howes' theme. He describes actual experiences where this has been done.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 11:368-72. N. '25. Use of Strategy in Debate. Warren C. Shaw.

"The real strategy in debate is not concerned with debate management but rather with the building up of cases and the preparation of speeches."

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 12:11-22. F. '26. Parliamentary Procedure and Formal Debating. William H. Davis.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 12:175-80. Ap. '26. Oregon Plan of Debating. J. Stanley Gray.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 12:180-6. Ap. '26. Recent Debate Questionnaire. W. P. Sandford.

A condensed version of an oral report given at the New York convention on the results of a questionnaire on courses in argumentation and debate. One hundred and forty-four replies were analyzed to make this report.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 12:182-95. Je. '26. Vitalizing the Course of Study in Argumentation and Debate. W. Arthur Cable.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 13:53-4. F. '27. Non-Decision Debates. E. H. Paget.

It is the author's opinion that all the evils to be found in the regular style of debate may occur also in the no-decision debate.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 13:54-6. F. '27. Use of Charts in Debate. Raymond H. Barnard.

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 13:309-10. Je. '27. Oregon Plan of Debate: Letter. Gladys M. Graham.

Approves the Oregon plan as it puts a premium on basic ability and trained thought.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 14:86-94. F. '28. Survey of Intercollegiate Debate in the Mid-West Debate Conference. Mildred F. Berry.

The results of a questionnaire sent to 103 colleges in the Middle West show what the consensus of opinion on general practice is on such points as Financing the debate; Types of debate; Questions chosen; Length of speeches; Rebuttals; Coaching, etc.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 14:94-111. F. '28. Measurement and Analysis of Audience Opinion. Howard S. Woodward.

An analysis of votes of the audience taken before and after the debate, over a period of three years, in the "Forum Debates" held at Western Reserve University.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 14:112-16. F. '28. The English Debates: letter. Raymond F. Howes.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 14:117-19. F. '28. Plea for the Short High School Debate: letter. Raymond H. Barnard.

His claim is that the short debate is superior in respect to the debater, to debate technique, and to the audience.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 14:218-23. Ap. '28. Debate or Politics? Henry C. Klingbeil.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 14:223-32. Ap. '28. Rating Scale for Public Speakers. Bibliog. Wilmer E. Stevens.

An actual scale is presented, accompanied by explanation and description.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 14:269-71. Ap. '28. Tournament Idea in High School Debating. Raymond H. Barnard.

He urges the same independence in making schedules for debate on the part of the high schools that the college has.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 14:553-63. N. '28. Can We Revive Public Interest in Intercollegiate Debates? Wilbur E. Gilman.

Discusses the value of publicity for bringing the debating activities of the college or school to the attention of the community and increasing its interest and attendance.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 15:92-4. F. '29. Tournament Debating; Reply to R. H. Barnard. Rupert L. Cortright.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 15:149-51. F. '29. Questions Being Debated in American Colleges and Universities: During the School Year 1928-29.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 15:254-6. Ap. '29. Decalogue of Contest Debating. W. Arthur Cable.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 15:364-74. Je. '29. Shifting the Emphasis: an Argument for No-Decision Debating. William Schrier.

He discusses the evils due to placing the emphasis on winning the debate and answers the objections of the no-decision plan.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 15:413-17. Je. '29. Professor Cable's Decalogue; reply. Raymond F. Howes.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 15:417-20. Je. '29. Expert Judge of Debating. Leon McCarty.

Quarterly Journal of Speech. 15:421-2. Je. '29. Consensus in Debate. Teresina Marino.

A suggestion for removing from the open-forum the character of aimlessness and so making it a serious discussion type of debate.

Review of Reviews. 69:439-40. Ap. '24. British Debating Methods in American Universities.

School and Society. 19:525-6. My. 3, '24. The Competitive Debate.

School and Society. 27:770-4. Je. 30, '28. On College Debating.

Robert Withington. (Same. Wilson Bulletin. 3:401-5. D. '28.)

School and Society. 28:660-2. N. 24, '28. Debating in our High Schools. H. Adelbert White.

Discusses the results of a questionnaire addressed to the extension divisions or similar agencies in various states of the Union.

School Review. 19:534-45; 20:120-4. O. '11; F. '12. Debating in the High School. Bertha Lee Gardner.

School Review. 19:546-9. O. '11. Motivation of Debate in Our Secondary Schools. A. Monroe Stowe.

School Review. 19:689-93. D. '11. Debating in the High School. E. C. Hartwell.

A criticism of Miss Gardner's article.

School Review. 20:379-82. Je. '12. New Plan for a Contest in Public Speaking. S. H. Clark.

School Review. 34:331-2. My. '26. Fostering Dishonesty.

He deplores the state championship series of debates as having little educational value and putting the emphasis on winning.

School Review. 35:538-46. S. '27. Selection of the Proposition for Debate. Walter H. Adams.

Scribner's Magazine. 47:378-9. Mr. '10. Matter of Debate.

United States. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1914, No. 19

University Extension in the United States. Louis E. Reber.

See p. 38-41 for a list of the departments of debating and public discussion that send out package libraries to the citizens of their respective states.

Wilson Bulletin. 3:43-6. Ja. '27. Elements of Good Debating; a Guide for Judges. Willis T. Newton.

Wilson Bulletin. 3:48-9, 65. Ja.-Mr. '27; 159-61. Ja '28. Debating Activities, 1926-27; 1927-28.

Lists of questions used in debates during the seasons 1926-27 and 1927-28.





## APPENDIX B

### SUBJECT INDEX TO BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS CONTAINING COMPLETE DEBATES, REFERENCES, BRIEFS AND SIMILAR MATERIAL FOR DEBATES

#### BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS ANALYZED

##### Abridged Debaters' Handbook Series.

A series of pamphlets, each of which contains affirmative and negative briefs, references and reprints of selected articles on popular subjects for debate. 25c.-75c. ea. Published by The H. W. Wilson Co. (Succeeded by The Reference Shelf.)

Arnold, John H. Debaters' Guide. rev. and enl. \$2. Handy Book Corporation. Harrisburg, Pa. 1923.

Askew, John Bertram. Pros and Cons: A Newspaper Reader's and Debater's Guide to the Leading Controversies of the Day. 6th ed. rev. and rewritten by Hilderic Cousens. 2s. 6d. Dutton. 1920. Out of print.

Both Sides: Briefs for Debate on Important Questions of the Day. Prepared for the Use of Schools, Debating Societies and Lyceums, by the Independent. Reprinted from the weekly issues. 25c. 1916.

Subjects: Single six-year term for president; Death penalty; Price maintenance; Minimum wage legislation; Mothers' pensions; Who is responsible for the war; Shall we have a government-owned merchant marine; Shall we enlarge our army; Convict labor in the United States; Problem of the trusts; Monroe doctrine; Military training for college students; Embargo on arms; Mexico and the United States.

Bringing the World to America: A List of Reference Readings on International Affairs. 12p. pa. Our World Institute. 9 E. 37th St., New York. 1924 (?)

Carpenter, Oliver Clinton. Debate Outlines on Public Questions. 6th ed. rev. \$1.90. Minton, Balch & Co. New York. 1928.

Craig, Asa H. and Edgerton, Alice Craig. Both Sides of Thirty Public Questions Completely Debated (pros and cons). rev. ed. 563p. \$2.25. Noble and Noble. N.Y. 1926.

##### Debaters' Handbook Series.

This series consists of a number of volumes, each containing briefs, bibliographies and selected articles from books and periodicals, on popular subjects for debate. Cloth, \$1.25-\$2.25 ea. The H. W. Wilson Co.

Debaters Research. Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

Pamphlets are issued on various questions of the day, each containing excerpts from many articles on the subject. These excerpts are classified under the various arguments for and against the subject.  
Handbook Series.

Each volume in this series contains a bibliography and reprints of the best available material on popular questions of the day. \$1.25-\$2.40 ea. For sale by The H. W. Wilson Co.

Kansas. University Extension Division. High School Debating League, Announcement for 1925-26 (April 15, 1925); 1926-27 (July 1, 1926); 1927-28 (September 1, 1927); 1928-29 (September 1, 1928).

Library of Congress.

Lists of references on many popular subjects, compiled under the direction of the Chief Bibliographer. These may be secured from the Superintendent of Documents at the prices indicated after each list, except those which may be secured only thru the Public Affairs Information Service, 11 W. 40th St., New York, N.Y. These are distinguished by the symbol (P.A.I.S.) at the end of the entry.

Lyon, Leverett S. Elements of Debating. \*\$1.25. University of Chicago Press. 1913.

Mabie, Edward Charles. University Debaters' Annual: Constructive and Rebuttal Speeches Delivered in the Intercollegiate Debates of American Colleges and Universities during the College Year. Vol. I. 1914-1915. Vol. II. 1915-1916. Out of print. H. W. Wilson Co.

Montana. University Extension Department. Montana High School Debating League. August of each year from 1918 to 1928 inclusive.

Nichols, Egbert Ray. Intercollegiate Debates: Yearbook of College Debating with Records of Questions and Decisions, Specimen Speeches and Bibliographies. Volumes II-VII. \$2.50 ea. Noble and Noble. N.Y. 1909-1917.

Nichols, Egbert Ray. Intercollegiate Debates: a Yearbook of College Debating. Volumes VIII-IX. \$2.50 ea. Noble and Noble. N.Y. 1927-1928.

North Carolina. University. Extension Bulletin. Vol. I. No. 8. (Out of print); Vol. IV. No. 7; Vol V. No. 6; Vol. VII. No. 6; Vol. VIII. No. 5.

North Carolina. University Record. Extension Series No. 40, November, 1920.

Oklahoma. University.

Bulletins, published by the Department of Public Discussion and Debate and also by the Department of Public Information and Welfare, of the University Extension Division, each containing collections of facts and arguments on both sides of public questions.

- Pattee, George K. *Practical Argumentation*. rev. ed. \$1.75. Century. 1917.
- Pearson, Paul M. *Intercollegiate Debates: Being Briefs and Reports of Many Intercollegiate Debates*. \$2.50. Noble and Noble. N. Y. 1909.
- Phelps, Edith M. *University Debaters' Annual: Constructive and Rebuttal Speeches Delivered in the Intercollegiate Debates of American Colleges and Universities during the College Year*. Vol. III. 1916-1917—Vol. IX. 1922-1923 (out of print); Vol. X. 1923-1924—Vol. XV. 1928-1929. \$2.25 ea. H. W. Wilson Co.
- Reference Shelf.**  
Each number contains briefs, bibliographies and selected articles on subjects for debate. Price 90c. ea. The H. W. Wilson Co.
- Ringwalt, Ralph C. *Briefs on Public Questions*. \*\$1.50. Longmans. 1913.
- Robbins, E. C. *High School Debate Book*. new and rev. ed. \$1.50. A. C. McClurg & Co. 1923.
- Shurter, Edwin DuBois. *Both Sides of 100 Public Questions Briefly Debated*. \$2. Noble and Noble. N.Y. 1925.
- Speaker (The). Vol. VII. \$2.50. Noble and Noble. N.Y.
- Thomas, Ralph W. *Manual of Debate*. \$1. American Book Co. 1910.
- Winning Intercollegiate Debates and Orations*. Pi Kappa Delta, National Honorary Forensic Society. Vols. 1-2. Fort Collins, Colo. 1926, 1928.
- Wisconsin. University.  
Bulletins published by the Department of Debating and Public Discussion, on popular subjects for debate. Most of these contain a brief historical statement, arguments pro and con, and references. Mimeographed articles, not easily available in printed form, may also be had from the Department. List with prices, sent on request.

## SUBJECT INDEX

**Academic Freedom**

- Johnsen. *Academic Freedom*. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 6.) 110p. Briefs, references and selected articles.
- . *Questions of the Hour*. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 10-11. References.

**Advertising**

- National Advertising, as Now Carried on, Is Both Socially and Economically Harmful. Phelps. Vol. XV. Chap. VIII. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Agriculture. Relief.** *See* Farm Relief

### **Agricultural Credit**

Agricultural Banks. Askew, p. 3-4. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Bullock. Agricultural Credit. (Handbook Series.) xiv, 177p. References and selected articles. o.p.

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on Agricultural Credit. 8p. Typew. 40c. 1918. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of References on Agricultural Credit. 14p. mime. Feb. 21, 1924.

### **Air Service (United States)**

The Air Service of the United States Should Be a Separate Department of Our National Defense. Phelps, Vol. XII. p. 283-312. Speeches, briefs and references.

### **Alien and Sedition Laws, 1798**

Library of Congress. List of References on Alien and Sedition Laws, 1798. 14p. Typew. \$1.50. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

**Alien Property.** *See* Enemy Property

### **Aliens**

Library of Congress. List of References on the Rights of Aliens in the United States. 11p. Typew. \$1.20. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

### **Allied Debts. Cancellation**

Arnold. p. 260-3. References.

Carpenter. p. 183-7. Briefs and references.

Gerould and Turnbull. Interallied Debts and Revision of the Debt Settlements. (Handbook Series. Ser. II. Vol. 4.) xxxv, 489p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Johnsen. Cancellation of the Allied Debt. (Reference Shelf. Vol. I. No. 1.) 61p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Phelps. Vol. XIII. p. 211-63. Speeches, briefs and references.

### **Americanization**

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 14-15. References.

### **Arbitration, Commercial**

Bloomfield. Commercial Arbitration. (Handbook Series.) xxxv, 341p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

**Arbitration, Industrial**

All Labor Disputes Should Be Submitted to a Board Having Compulsory Powers. Craig and Edgerton. p. 547-50. Outlines.

Beman. Compulsory Arbitration and Compulsory Investigation of Industrial Disputes. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 4th ed. lxvi,303p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Compulsory Arbitration of Railway Labor Disputes. Phelps. Vol. VI. p. 155-91. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 142-3. Arguments and references.

Compulsory Industrial Arbitration. Askew. p. 10. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

———. Independent. 88:260. N. 6, '16. Briefs and references.

———. Montana. High School Debating League, 1920. p. 12-18. References.

———. Oklahoma University. Bulletin. Exten. Ser. No. 34. O. 1, '17. References and selected articles for both sides.

———. Phelps. Vol. VI. p. 193-246. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

———. Ringwalt. p. 210-18. Briefs and references.

The Government Should Settle All Disputes Between Capital and Labor. Craig and Edgerton. p. 535-43. Arguments.

Labor and Capital Should be Compelled to Settle Their Disputes Through Legally Constituted Boards of Arbitration. Carpenter. p. 213-19. Briefs and references.

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on Industrial Arbitration (sup. to mim. list, Jan. 5, 1920.) 9p. mim. Nov. 2, 1922.

Phelps. Vol. III. p. 99-146, 191-225; also Vol. IV. p. 1-53, 147-91; also Vol. IX. p. 87-151. Speeches, briefs and references. All o.p.

**Arbitration, International**

An International Court for all International Disputes. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 252-4. Arguments and references.

Library of Congress. List of References. 151p. 20c. 1908.

**Arbitration, International—Continued**

Reely. World Peace, Including International Arbitration and Disarmament. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxv, 199p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

*See also* Bok Peace Plan; League of Nations; League to Enforce Peace; Peace.

**Army (United States). Increase**

The Army Should Be Enlarged and Strengthened. Independent. 8:36. Ja. 4, '15. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

Bacon. National Defense. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Increase of the Army and Navy. Mabie. Vol. I. p. 1-180. Reports of debates and references. o.p.

It Is Good Government for the United States to Maintain a Greater Standing Army Than Is Actually Necessary to Enforce the Laws of the Country. Craig and Edgerton. p. 486-503. Discussions.

Johnsen. National Defense. Vol. III. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) p. xxxiv-xxxvii, 59-84. References and selected articles. o.p.

Nichols. Vol. VII. p. 337-83. Speeches.

Preparedness. Literary Digest. 52:509-10. F. 26, '16. Briefs and references.

———. Mabie. Vol. II, p. 43-77. Report of debate, briefs and references. o.p.

The United States Army Should Be Increased to One Thousand for Each Million of Our Population. Thomas. p. 200. Arguments.

Van Valkenburgh. National Defense. Vol. II. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) liv, 204p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

**Asset Currency**

An Asset Currency System Should Be Established under Federal Control. Pearson. p. 191-8. Synopsis of debate and references.

Issuance of National Bank Notes on General Assets. Ringwalt. p. 143-50. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 188-90. Arguments and references.

**Athletics**

Intercollegiate Athletics, as at Present Conducted, Should Be Abolished. Robbins. p. 173-8. Briefs and references.

Intercollegiate Athletics Promote the Best Interests of Colleges. Thomas. p. 186. Arguments.

———. Speaker. Vol. VII. p. 295-301. Negative brief.

Intercollegiate Foot-ball Promotes the Best Interests of College Life. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 62-3. Arguments and references.

Interscholastic Athletics Is Detrimental to the High School. Montana. High School Debating League, 1927. p. 9-11. References.

Johnsen. Interscholastic Athletics. (Reference Shelf. Vol. VI. No. 2.) 182p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. List of References on Athletics in Colleges and Universities. 4p. Typew. 20c. 1916. (P.A. I.S.)

**Aviation, Military**

Johnsen. National Defense. (Handbook Series. Ser. II. Vol. 6.) p. lxxiii-lxxii, 403-69. Briefs, references and selected articles.

**Bank Deposit Guaranty**

There Should Be Legislation Providing for the Guarantee of Bank Deposits. Pearson. p. 305-21. Report of speeches and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 120-1. Arguments and references.

———. Wisconsin University Bulletin. 5c. Arguments and references.

**Bank-Notes. Taxation**

The Law Which Imposes a Tax on State Bank Notes Should Be Repealed. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 179-81. Arguments and references.

**Banks and Banking**

Greenbacks Should Be Retired and the Government Should Go Out of Its Present System of Banking. Craig and Edgerton. p. 232-49. Discussions.

National Banks Should Be Abolished. Craig and Edgerton. p. 358-65. Outlines.



**Banks and Banking—Continued**

The United States Should Establish a Central Bank. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 249-51. Arguments and references.

**Banks and Banking, Cooperative**

Library of Congress. List of References on Co-operative and Labor Banks. 13p. Typew. \$1.40. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

**Banks and Banking, Trade Union**

United States. Dept. of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Labor Banks in the United States: List of References; comp. by Laura A. Thompson. p. 205-14. (661-70.) 1926. (Reprinted from Monthly Labor Review. S. 1926.)

**Baumes Law.** *See* Criminal Law

**Birth Control**

The Dissemination of Knowledge of Birth Control by Contraceptive Methods Should Be Legalized Thruout the United States. Phelps. Vol. XI. p. 221-76. Speeches, briefs and references.

Johnsen. Birth Control. (Handbook Series.) lxxxiii, 369p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

**Bok Peace Plan**

Phelps. Vol. X. Chap. VI. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Bonus.** *See* Soldiers' Bonus

**Boycott**

The Boycott is a Legitimate Means of Securing Concessions from Employers. Carpenter. p. 220-3. Briefs and references.

**Bulgaria**

Stanoyevich. Slavonic Nations of Yesterday and Today. (Handbook Series) p. xliii-xlvi, 383-415. References and selected articles.

**Cabinet (United States)**

Members of the President's Cabinet Should Have Seats and a Voice in the Discussion in Both Houses of Congress. Nichols. Vol. IV. p. 1-55. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Vol. XI. p. 175-219. Speeches, briefs and references.

———. Thomas. p. 164-5. Arguments and references.

**Cabinet System of Government**

Askew. p. 19. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Courtney and Stovall. Parliamentary vs. Congressional Government: A Debater's Handbook. Debaters Research. Vol. 6. Sept. 1928. \$2.10. Briefs and references.

The English Parliamentary Form of Government Is Preferable to the Presidential Form of the United States. Kansas University Bulletin, September 1, 1928. p. 28-30. References.

Ettrude. Cabinet Form of Government. (Reference Shelf. Vol. 1. No. 6.) 111p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

The Federal Government of the United States Should Adopt the Cabinet-parliamentary Form of Government. Montana. High School Debating League, 1923. p. 17-20. References.

In a Democracy the Cabinet Form of Government Is Preferable to the Presidential Form of Government. Phelps. Vol. XI. p. 1-74. Speeches, briefs and references.

Johnsen. Cabinet Form of Government. (Reference Shelf. Vol. V. No. 10.) 216p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. Select List of Books on the Cabinets of England and America. 8p. 10c. 1903.

Parliamentary Form of Government for the United States. Phelps. Vol. VII. p. 199-247. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

Parliamentary versus the Presidential form of Government. Nichols. Vol. III. p. 239-309. Speeches and references.

———. Pearson. p. 367-73. Report of debate and references.

Phelps. Vol. V. p. 1-45. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

Shurter. Both Sides. p. 144-6. Arguments and references.

The United States Should Adopt a Cabinet Form of Government Modeled after that of Great Britain. Arnold. p. 300-2. References.

**Calendar**

Eastman Kodak Company. Business Library. Calendar Reform, 1926-April, 1928. Rochester, N.Y. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.). References.

Johnsen. Thirteen-Month Calendar. (Reference Shelf. Vol. VI. No. 5.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

**California Alien Land Law**

California's Anti-Alien Land Legislation Is Unjustified. Independent. 75: 141. O. 16, '13. Briefs and references.

**Campaign Funds**

All Contributions of \$100 and over, to Political Parties, Should Be Publicly Accounted for by the Officers Receiving Them. Thomas. p. 174. Arguments and references.

**Canada. Annexation**

Canada Should Become Part of the United States. Carpenter. p. 163-6. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 47-8. Arguments and references.

**Capital Punishment**

Arnold. p. 307-9. References and affirmative discussion.

Beman. Capital Punishment. (Handbook Series.) lxviii, 366p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Capital Punishment is a Wise Public Policy. Talley vs. Darrow. Debate. 62p. \$1. League for Public Discussion. N. Y. 1924.

Capital Punishment Should Be Abolished. Askew. p. 23. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Fanning. Capital Punishment. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 3d ed. xxvi, 299p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

Independent. 82:264. My. 10, '15. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

Library of Congress. Select List of References. 45p. 10c. 1912.

Lyon. p. 128-9. Arguments and references.

Robbins. p. 45-52. Briefs and references.

Shurter. Both Sides. p. 32-3. Arguments and references.

Thomas. p. 184. Arguments and references.

**Censorship. Literature**

Limitations Upon the Contents of Books and Magazines as Defined in Proposed Legislation Would Be Detrimental to the Advancement of American Literature. Boyd vs. Sumner. Debate. 77p. \$1. League for Public Discussion. N. Y. 1924.

**Child Labor**

Bullock. *Child Labor*. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. xxvi, 238p. References and selected articles. Out of print.

The Child Labor Amendment, As Recently Proposed and Rejected by the Several States, Should Be Adopted. Montana. High School Debating League, 1926. p. 9-14. References.

The Constitution of the United States Should Be so Amended as to Allow Congress to Pass Legislation Regulating Child Labor. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 45-129. Speeches and references (two debates).

———. *Winning Intercollegiate Debates and Orations*. Vol. 1. p. 9-95. Two debates, briefs and references.

Detroit, Michigan. Public Library. List of References on Federal Regulation of Child Labor, Including Some General References on States' Rights and Federal Usurpation. 19p. Typew. \$2. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

The Employment of Children in Factories and Similar Industries Should Be Forbidden. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 150-1. Arguments and references.

Johnsen. *Child Labor*. (Handbook Series). Briefs, references and selected articles.

———. *Child Labor*. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 9.) 109p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. List of Books (with References to Periodicals.) 66p. 15c. 1906.

———. List of References on Child Labor in the United States and Great Britain. 24p. mime. 1923.

The Proposed Twentieth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Should Be Adopted. Kansas University Bulletin, April 15, 1925. p. 29-33. References.

———. Phelps. Vol. XI. p. 367-414; Vol. XII. p. 341-403. Speeches, briefs and references.

Stovall and Hall. Proposed Twentieth Amendment to the Federal Constitution: Pro and Con. Debaters Research. Vol. 2. No. 1. 75c. 1925. Arguments.

United States. Dept. of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Woman and Child Labor: Federal Control of Child Labor: List of References; comp. by Laura A. Thompson. p. 71-101. 1925. (Reprinted from Monthly Labor Review. Ja. 1925.)

**Child Labor—Continued**

United States. Dept. of Labor. Childrens' Bureau. Child Labor, Outlines for Study. rev. to Ag. 15, 1925, with Lists of References by E. N. Matthews and others. (Bureau publication 93.) 5th ed. VI, 61p. 10c. Ag. 1926.

**China**

The Integrity of the Chinese Empire Should Be Preserved. Carpenter. p. 143-6. Briefs and References.

Johnsen. China Yesterday and Today. (Handbook Series. Ser. II. Vol. 3.) lxxviii, 362p. References and selected articles.

Library of Congress. China: Some Recent Writings. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Publishers' Weekly. 115:2929-30 Je. 29, '29. China: a List of Books to Further an Understanding of Her Position in the World Today.

**Christian Science**

The Doctrine of Christian Science Is Justifiable. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 152-4. Arguments and references.

**City Manager Plan**

All American Cities Should Adopt the Dayton, Ohio, City Manager Plan of Municipal Government. Independent. 86:40 Ap. 3, '16. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 258-60. Arguments and references.

Beman. Municipal Government. (Handbook Series.) Part III. Briefs, references and selected articles.

The City Manager Form of Government Should Be Adopted by All New England Cities of Over 100,000 Population, Except Boston. Mabie. Vol. II, p. 145-78. Report of debate, briefs and references. o.p.

Cleveland. Municipal Reference Library. References. 37p. Typew. 1917. (Obtainable only thru P. A. I. S.)

Library of Congress. List of References on the City Manager Plan. 15p. Typew. 75c. 1919. (P. A. I. S.)

Mabie. City Manager Plan. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxix, 245p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

Montana. High School Debating League, 1919. p. 13-16. References.

Nichols. Vol. VII. p. 109-205. Speeches and references.

Oklahoma University Bulletin. Exten. Ser. No. 43. O. 15, '18. References and selected articles.

Robbins. p. 59-67. Briefs and references.

### **Civil Service. Examinations**

A Competitive Civil Service Examination Is Needed in the Separate States. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 43-4. Arguments and references.

### **Coeducation**

Coeducation Is a Failure. Phelps. Vol. XIV. p. 1-38. Speeches, briefs and references.

Coeducation Should Be Generally Adopted in American Colleges and Universities. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 36-7. Arguments and references.

**Closed Shop.** *See* Open and Closed Shop

### **Collective Bargaining**

Library of Congress. List of References on Individual and Collective Bargaining with Special Reference to the Transportation Industry. 27p. Typew. \$2.60. 1923. (P. A. I. S.)

North Carolina. University Record. November, 1920. Briefs, references and selected articles.

**College Athletics.** *See* Athletics

**College Education.** *See* Education

**Commercial Arbitration.** *See* Arbitration, Commercial

### **Commission Government. Cities**

Beman. Municipal Government. (Handbook Series.) Part II. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. Select List of References on Commission Government for Cities. 70p. 10c. 1913.

———. List of References on Commission Government for Cities (Supplementary to printed list, 1913.) 8p. Typew. 40c. 1917. (P. A. I. S.)

Nichols. Vol. III. p. 1-39. Speeches and references.

Pearson. p. 461-77. Synopsis of debate and references.

**Commission Government. Cities—Continued**

Robbins. Commission Plan of Municipal Government. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 3d ed. xxix, 180p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

Shurter. Both Sides. p. 58-9. Arguments and references.

Wisconsin University Bulletin. 5c. 1911. Arguments and references. o.p.

**Commission Government. Counties**

Library of Congress. List of References on County Government, Including Commission Government for Counties. 11p. Typew. 55c. 1915. (P. A. I. S.)

**Companionate Marriage.** *See* Marriage, Companionate

**Compulsory Industrial Arbitration.** *See* Arbitration, Industrial

**Compulsory Insurance.** *See* Insurance. State and Compulsory

**Compulsory Military Service.** *See* Military Service

**Conservation of Natural Resources**

Fanning. Conservation of Natural Resources. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xv, 153p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Federal Control of Our Natural Resources Should Be Further Strengthened and Extended. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 83-4. Arguments and references.

Library of Congress. Select List of References. 110p. 15c. 1912.

The Power of the Federal Government Should Be Paramount to That of the States in the Conservation of Natural Resources, Limited to Forests, Water-power and Minerals. Robbins. p. 68-80. Briefs and references.

The Power of the National Government Should Be Paramount to That of the States in the Conservation of Natural Resources. Nichols. Vol. II. p. 235-80. Speeches and references.

**Constitutional Guarantees**

The Guarantees of the Constitution Should Be Extended to All Persons and Territory under the Permanent Control of the United States. Carpenter. p. 151-4. Briefs and references.

**Convict Labor**

Library of Congress. List of References on Prison Labor 74p. 10c. 1915.

United States. Dept. of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Recent References on Convict Labor; comp. by Edna L. Stone. p. 181-200. (867-86.) 1925. (Reprinted from Monthly Labor Review. O. 1925.)

Unpaid Convict Labor Is Slavery and Should Be Abolished in the United States. Independent. 75:494-6. Ag. 28, '13. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

**Cooperation.**

Cooperation versus Capitalism. Askew. p. 35-6; versus Collectivism. Askew. p. 36-7; versus National Guilds. Askew. p. 37. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Cooperative Movement. Zimand. Modern Social Movements. p. 67-80. Bibliography. H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1921. o.p.

United States. Dept. of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Cooperative Movement, Selected Bibliography; comp. by Florence E. Parker. p. 201-32. (659-90.) 1925. (Reprinted from Monthly Labor Review. Mr. 1925.)

**Copyright**

The International Copyright Law Is Justifiable. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 167-9. Arguments and references.

**County Manager Plan**

Muller. County Manager Plan. (Reference Shelf. Vol. VI. No. 6.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

**County Unit Plan.** *See* School Administration. County Unit Plan

**Courses of Study**

The Exercise of Legislative Authority in the Control of the Specific Content of Courses Offered in Educational Institutions is Contrary to Public Welfare. Phelps. Vol. XII. p. 265-315. Speeches, briefs and references.

A Three-years Course for the A.B. Degree Should Be Adopted by Colleges and Universities. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 147-9. Arguments and references.



**Crime and Criminals**

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 21-2. References.

Kirby. Criminal Justice. (Handbook Series.) liii,314p. References and selected articles

Kuhlman, A. F. Guide to Material on Crime and Criminal Justice. 633p. \$12. H. W. Wilson Co. N. Y. 1929. References.

**Criminal Laws and Procedure**

California. State Library. Law and Legislative Reference Department. Bibliography on Criminal Law and Procedure. 20p. Typew. \$2.10. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

A Criminal Code, Similar in Procedure to the Criminal Code of Great Britain, Should Be Adopted Throughout the United States. (Constitutionality waived). Phelps. Vol. XV. Chap. II. Speeches, briefs and references.

Johnsen. Baumes Law. (Reference Shelf. Vol. VI. No. 3.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. Baumes Laws; a Bibliographical List. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

**Criminal Syndicalism**

California Criminal Syndicalism Law. Phelps. Vol. X. Chap. II. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Cuba. Annexation**

Cuba Should Be Annexed to the United States. Carpenter. p. 159-62. Briefs and references.

———. Craig and Edgerton. p. 61-76. Discussions.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 45-6. Arguments and references.

**Czechoslovakia**

Stanoyevich. Slavonic Nations of Yesterday and Today. (Handbook Series.) p. xxxi-xxxv,267-322. References and selected articles.

**Daylight Saving**

Askew. p. 39. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Independent. 90:249. My. 5, '17. Briefs and references.

New York (state) Library. Legislative Ref. Sec. Bibliography: Daylight Saving. G. H. Faison. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1924. (P. A. I. S.)

**Direct Legislation.** *See* Referendum

**Direct Primaries.** *See* Primaries

### Disarmament

Arnold. p. 268-70. References.

Boston. Public Library. Disarmament and Substitutes for War. (Brief Reading Lists. No. 21. November, 1921.) 17p. pa. 5c. 1921. References.

Johnsen. National Defense. Vol. III. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) p. lviii-lix, 253-79. References and selected articles. o.p.

Library of Congress. Brief List of References on the Washington, D. C., Conference on the Limitation of Armament. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1922. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of References on International Arbitration. 20c. 1908.

———. List of References on Naval Disarmament. 5p. Typew. 60c. Mr. 30, 1921. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of References on the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament, 1921-1922. 27p. Typew. \$2.60. December 27, 1922. (P. A. I. S.)

———. Russia's Proposal for Disarmament: a List of References. 4p. Typew. 50c. 1929 (P.A.I.S.)

Navy for Police Duty Only. Phelps. Vol. VIII. p. 251-82. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

———. Shurter. Science and Art of Effective Debating. Appendices III and IV. Noble and Noble. New York. 1925. Specimen debate, with bibliography.

Reely. Disarmament. (Handbook Series.) xxi, 320p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

———. World Peace, Including International Arbitration and Disarmament. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxv, 199p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

The Time Is Now Ripe for the Disarmament of Nations. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 255-7. Arguments and references.

### Divorce

Askew. p. 53-8. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Congress Should Enact a Uniform Marriage and Divorce Law, Constitutionality Conceded. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 391-458. Speeches and references.

**Divorce—Continued**

A Federal Divorce Law. Ringwalt. p. 194-201. Briefs and references.

Johnsen. Marriage and Divorce. (Handbook Series.) li, 293p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. List of References on Uniform Divorce Laws. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

———. A List of References on Uniform Divorce Laws. 9p. Typew. \$1. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

List of References Submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary (U. S. 63d Congress, 3d Session) in Connection with S. J. Res. 109. 110p. pa. Govt. Ptg. Office. Washington, D. C. 1915.

United States Constitution Should Be Amended to Provide for Uniform Divorce Laws. Carpenter. p. 103-7. Briefs and references.

The United States Should Have Further Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 12-13. Arguments and references.

*See also* Marriage Laws

**Education**

Education As It Is Now Thrust Upon the Youth of America is Dangerous to Health and Good Government. Craig and Edgerton. p. 351-7. Outlines.

Education Is the Curse of the Age. Phelps. Vol. XII. p. 313-40. Speeches, briefs and references.

In the United States We Are Attempting to Give Too Many People a College Education. Montana. High School Debating League, 1928. p. 9-11. References.

———. Phelps. Vol. XIV. p. 239-91. Speeches, briefs and references.

Library of Congress. List of References on the Dalton Plan. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

**Education, Compulsory**

Public Education Should Be Made Compulsory for All Children Who Are Fourteen Years of Age or Under. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 135-7. Arguments and references.

**Education. Curricula.** *See* Courses of Study

**Education, Department of.** *See* United States. Department of Education (Proposed)

### **Education and State**

State Property Tax to Aid in the Support of An Eight-Months' School Term. North Carolina. University Extension Division Bulletin. Vol. V. No. 6. November 16, 1925. Articles and references.

The State Should Supervise and Control Primary and Secondary Education. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 138-9. Arguments and references.

### **Eight Hour Day**

Eight Hour Day for Agricultural Workers and Seamen. Askew. p. 64-5. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Library of Congress. Brief List of References on the Three-Shift System in Continuous Industries. 3p. Typew. 40c. Je. 2, '21. (P. A. I. S.)

Shurter. p. 60-1. Both Sides. Arguments and references.

Thomas. p. 200. Arguments.

### **Elections (United States)**

The Federal Government Should Have Control Over National Elections. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 81-2. Arguments and references.

Fraud Practiced in Our Elections Could Be Eliminated by Adopting the English System of Prevention. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 34-5. Arguments and references.

Library of Congress. Elections in the United States: a Brief Bibliographical List. 4p. Typew. 50c. 1929. (P.A.I.S.)

The Present Caucus System Should Be Abolished. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 155-7. Arguments and references.

### **Electoral College**

Beman. Abolishment of the Electoral College. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 7.) 121p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

### **Employers' Liability**

Employers Should Be Forced to Duly Compensate all Employees Injured While in Their Employ. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 173-5. Arguments and references.

**Employers' Liability—Continued**

Library of Congress. Select List of References on Employer's Liability and Workmen's Compensation. 196p. 25c. 1911.

*See also* Workmen's Compensation

**Enemy Property**

Library of Congress. List of References on the Return of Alien Property. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

**Evolution**

Phelps. Evolution. (Handbook Series.) liii, 283p. References and selected articles. (Part II covers the teaching of the evolution theory in schools and colleges.)

**Excess Profits Tax**

Askew. p. 69. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Library of Congress. List of References on Excess Profits Taxation. 5p. Typew. 25c. 1917. (P. A. I. S.)

Phelps. Vol. IX. p. 237-82. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

**Extraterritoriality**

The Foreign Countries Should Abandon Their Extraterritorial Policies in China. Phelps. Vol. XIII. p. 59-93. Speeches, brief and references.

The United States Should Not Acquire Further Territory in the Orient Except so Much as May Be Needed for Naval Stations. Carpenter. p. 147-50. Briefs and references.

**Far East**

Library of Congress. Far East: a List of Recent Books. 12p. Typew. \$1.30. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

**Farm Relief**

Beman. Farm Relief. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 8.) 226p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Congress Should Enact Legislation Embodying the Principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill. Nichols. Vol. IX. p. 1-77. Speeches and references (two debates).

———. Phelps. Vo. XIII. p. 1-58. Speeches, briefs and references.

A Farm Relief Bill Similar to the McNary-Haugen Bill Should Become a Law. Carpenter. p. 1-21. Briefs and references.

Federal Legislation Should Be Enacted Embodying the Principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill As Passed by the Sixty-Ninth Congress. Kansas University Bulletin, September 1, 1927. p. 29-34. References.

Johnsen. Agriculture and the Tariff. (Reference Shelf. Vol. V. No. 4.) 142p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

McNary-Haugen Farm Relief Bill: Pro and Con. Debaters Research. \$1.50. 1927. Arguments.

———. North Carolina. University Extension Division Bulletin. Vol. VII. No. 6. November 16, 1927. Articles and references.

### Fascism

Detroit, Michigan. Public Library. Civics Division. Selected List of References to Material on Fascist Government in Italy. 9p. Typew. \$1. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

Library of Congress. Benito Mussolini and the Fascist Movement in Italy; Recent References Supplementing Previous Lists. 13p. Typew. \$1.40. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of References on Benito Mussolini and the Fascist Movement in Italy (supplementary to typewritten List of references on the Fascisti, November 23, 1922). 9p. Typew. \$1. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

Federal Charter and Control. *See* Government Regulation of Industry

### Firearms

Beman. Outlawing the Pistol. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 10.) 77p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Five Day Week. *See* Hours of Labor

### Flood Prevention and Control

Beman. Flood Control. (Reference Shelf. Vol. V. No. 7.) 162p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Foreign Investments. *See* Investments, Foreign

### France

France Can Exert Greater Influence for World Peace Thru Regional Arrangements Such as the Locarno Pacts than Thru World Associations Such as the League of Nations. Phelps. Vol. XIV. p. 347-93. Speeches, briefs and references.

### Fraternities

Greek Letter Societies Are Detrimental to the Best Interests of the Academic World. Speaker. Vol. VII. p. 316-26. Outlines of speeches with references.

Secret Fraternities Should Not be Permitted in High Schools. Craig and Edgerton. p. 554-6. Outlines.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 64-6. Arguments and references.

———. Thomas. p. 206. Arguments.

### Free Trade and Protection

Abandonment of the Protective Tariff. Carpenter. p. 129-33. Briefs and references.

———. Nichols. Vol. II. p. 149-82. Speeches and references.

———. Pearson. p. 109-25. Synopsis of debate and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 129-31. Arguments and references.

Library of Congress. List of Recent Writings on the Tariff Act of 1922. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Morgan. Free Trade and Protection. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxix, 186p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Protection. Askew. p. 141-8. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Protection Is Preferable to Free Trade as a Commercial Policy for the United States. Ringwalt. p. 95-104. Briefs and references.

A Protective Tariff Is a Commercial and Economic Advantage to the United States. Thomas. p. 172. Arguments and references.

Raw Material Should Be Admitted to the United States Free of Duty. Nichols. Vol. II. p. 185-232. Speeches and references.

A Tariff for Revenue Only Is of Greater Benefit to the People of the United States Than a Protective Tariff. Craig and Edgerton. p. 160-71. Arguments.

Tariff Reform. Askew. p. 225-41. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

*See also* Trusts

**Freedom of Speech**

Library of Congress. List of References on Freedom of the Press and Speech and Censorship in Time of War (with Special Reference to the European War.) 9p. Typew. 45c. 1917. (P. A. I. S.)

The Principle of Complete Freedom of Speech on Political and Economic Questions Is Sound. Phelps. Vol. XV. Chap. V. Speeches, briefs and references.

Schroeder. Free Speech Bibliography. 247p. \$4. H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1922.

Suppression of Propaganda for the Overthrow of the United States Government. Phelps. Vol. VI. p. 293-373. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

**Freedom of the Press**

Liberty of the Press. Bulletin of the New York Public Library. 27:658-71. August, 1923.

**Freedom of the Seas**

Library of Congress. List of References on the Freedom of the Sea. 6p. Typew. 30c. 1917. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of References on Freedom of the Seas (Including Its Application to the European War). 12p. Typew. 60c. 1918. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of References on the Freedom of the Seas. (with Special Reference to the European War). 4p. Typew. 20c. 1917. (P. A. I. S.)

**Fundamentalist Controversy**

Vanderlaan. Fundamentalism vs. Modernism. (Handbook Series). References and selected articles.

**Gold (as Money)**

An International Gold Standard Should Be Adopted. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 206-7. Arguments and references.

Bimetallism and not Protection is the Secret of Future Prosperity. Craig and Edgerton. p. 366-75. Outlines.

The Single Gold Standard Is for the Best Interests of the Country. Craig and Edgerton. p. 28-60. Discussions.



**Government Ownership**

The Federal Government Should Construct all Irrigation Works. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 69-70. Arguments and references.

Government Ownership of Merchant Marine. Nichols. Vol. VI. p. 199-243. Speeches and references.

Library of Congress. List of References on Government Ownership and Control in Relation to Their Influence on Business, Political and Social Life. 6p. Typew. 30c. 1918. (P. A. I. S.)

Nationalization. Askew. p. 114-17. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

The State Should Operate and Conduct Manufacturies. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 170-2. Arguments and references.

**Government Ownership. Mines**

The Anthracite Coal Mines of the United States Should Be Taken Over and Operated by the United States Government. Carpenter. p. 75-82. Briefs and references.

Askew. p. 117-20. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Government Ownership of Coal Mines: Bates College Inter-scholastic Debating League of Maine. No. 686, 311. 31p. pa. 30c. Lewiston, Me. 1922. Selected articles, briefs and references.

The Government Should Own and Control the Coal Mines. Phelps. Vol. VI. p. 1-57; Vol. VII. p. 249-94; Vol. VIII. p. 287-331. All o.p. Speeches, briefs and references.

It Is For the Best Interests of All the People for the Government to Own and Control the Coal Mines. Craig and Edgerton. p. 318-26. Outlines.

Johnsen. Government Ownership of Coal Mines. (Hand-book Series). 325p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

———. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf, Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 50-1. References.

Library of Congress. List of References on Government Ownership and Control of Mines in the United States and Foreign Countries. 19p. Typew. 95c. 1918. (P. A. I. S.)

Pearson. p. 435-57. Synopsis of speeches and references.

**Government Ownership. Power Sites**

The United States Government Should Retain and Operate the Power Sites Now in Its Possession. Phelps. Vol. XV. Chap. IX. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Government Ownership. Railroads**

Arnold. p. 285-8. References.

Bureau of Railway Economics. Lists of Publications Pertaining to Government Ownership of Railways. Wash., D. C. 1914, 1919.

Carpenter. p. 96-102. Briefs and references.

The Government of the United States Should Own and Control the Railroads. Craig and Edgerton. p. 106-21. Discussions.

Library of Congress. List of Books (with References to Periodicals) on Railroads in Their Relation to the Government and the Public. 2d issue. 131p. 20c. 1907.

Nichols. Vol. IV. p. 255-99. Speeches and references. Vol. VI. p. 379-446. Speeches. Vol. VII. p. 385-446. Speeches and references.

Oklahoma University Bulletin. Exten. Ser. No. 21. 113p. Selected articles and references.

Phelps. Government Ownership of Railroads. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 3d ed. xxxvii, 201p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

———. Government Ownership of Railroads. Vol. II. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxxi, 200p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

———. Vol. III. p. 1-52. Vol. V. p. 47-81, 135-232. Speeches, briefs and references. All o.p.

Railway Nationalization. Askew. p. 120-2. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Ringwalt. p. 163-73. Briefs and references.

Robbins. p. 87-100. Briefs and references.

Shurter. Both Sides. p. 73-5. Arguments and references.

Thomas. p. 180. Arguments.

**Government Ownership. Telegraph, Telephone**

The Government of the United States Should Own and Control the Telephone and Telegraph Systems. Craig and Edgerton. p. 185-98. Discussions.

**Government Ownership. Telegraph, Telephone—Continued**

The Government of the United States Should Own and Control the Telephone and Telegraph Systems. Mabie. Vol. I. p. 387-434. Vol. II. p. 97-144. Both o.p. Report of debate, briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 79-80. Arguments and references.

The Government Should Maintain and Operate a Telegraph System in Connection with the Post Office. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 76-8. Arguments and references.

Judson. Government Ownership of Telegraph and Telephone. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) x1,204p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Nichols. Vol. VI. p. 1-68. Speeches and references.

Phelps. Government Ownership of the Telegraph. (Abridged Debaters' Handbook Series.) 32p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

**Government Regulation of Industry**

Federal Charter for Interstate Commerce. Nichols. Vol. IV. p. 189-251. Speeches and references.

———. Pearson. p. 39-64. Report of debate and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 239-41. Arguments and references.

Federal Control of Railroads. Pearson. p. 147-61. Report of debate and references.

Federal License for Interstate Commerce. Carpenter. 108-14. Briefs and references.

———. Thomas. p. 182. Arguments.

Johnsen. Government Regulation of the Coal Industry. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 1.) 144p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on the Attitude of Great Britain toward the Management and Control of Mines. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of References on Federal Control of Commerce and Corporations; Special Aspects and Applications. 104p. 15c. 1914.

———. List of References on Government Control of Wireless Telegraphy. 5p. Typew. 25c. 1919. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of References on Government Ownership and Control in Relation to Their Influence on Business.

Library of Congress. Select List of References on the Federal Regulation of the Production and Distribution of Oil and Coal. 6p. Typew. \$1. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

Local vs. State Control of Local Public Service Utilities. Washington State College. Bulletin. November, 1917. References.

Phelps. Federal Control of Interstate Corporations. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. xxx,240p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

———. Vol. IV. p. 193-236. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

The United States Government Should Create a Commission Empowered to Supervise and Control the Coal Industries Engaged in Interstate Commerce. Phelps. Vol. XII. p. 51-93. Speeches, briefs and references.

### **Great Britain. Parliament**

The English House of Lords Should Be Abolished. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 217-19. Arguments and references.

**Greek Language.** *See* Latin Language

**Guaranty of Bank Deposits.** *See* Bank Deposit Guaranty

### **Guild Socialism**

Askew. p. 111-14. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Zimand. Modern Social Movements. p. 185-205. Bibliography. H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1921. o.p.

### **Hawaii. Annexation**

The United States Should Annex Hawaii. Craig and Edgerton. p. 122-6. Arguments.

**Health Insurance.** *See* Insurance, Health

### **Hours of Labor**

Beman. Five Day Week. (Reference Shelf. Vol. V. No. 5.) 150p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Monthly Labor Review. 24:237-41. Ja. 1927. Five-Day Week in Industry: List of References; comp. by Laura A. Thompson.

### **Housing**

Library of Congress. List of Bibliographies on the House Problem. 3p. Typew. 15c. 1918. (P. A. I. S.)

**Housing** —*Continued*

Library of Congress. List of Bibliographies on the Housing Problem. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1925(?). (P.A.I.S.)

Municipalities Should House the Poor of the City. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 88-9. Arguments and references.

**Illiteracy**

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on Illiteracy. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

**Immigration**

Arnold. p. 253-7. References.

Bringing the World to America. p. 8. References.

Immigration is Detrimental to the United States. Craig and Edgerton. p. 206-18. Discussions.

Immigration Should Be Further Restricted. Pattee. p. 316-50. Negative argument and brief.

———. Robbins. p. 101-9. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 16-17. Arguments and references.

———. Thomas. p. 196. Arguments.

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf, Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 38. References.

Library of Congress. List of References on Immigration Legislation, 1911-1916, Supplementing Previous Lists on Immigration. 4p. Typew. 20c. 1916. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of References on the "National Origins" Provision in the Immigration Act of 1924. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Literacy Test for Immigrants. Independent. 85:234. F. 14, '16. Briefs and references.

———. Nichols. Vol. V. p. 151-217. Speeches and references.

———. Pearson. p. 165-87. Synopses of speeches and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 220-2. Arguments and references.

Loughran, E. W. and Madden, M. R. Outline Study of Immigration and Americanization. 19p. pa. Ward McDermott Press. Warren, R. I. 1921. Briefs and references.

Phelps. Immigration. (Handbook Series.) p. 13-255. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

Phelps. Restriction of Immigration. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 5.) 118p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Prohibition of European Immigration for Two Years. Phelps. Vol. VII. p. 55-103. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

Reely. Immigration. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. 315p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

United States. Dept. of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Restriction of Immigration, 1920-1925, Selected Bibliography; (1)+238-52p. (510-24) 1926. (Reprinted from Monthly Labor Review. F. 1926.)

The United States Should Place a High Tax Upon All Immigrants. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 90-1. Arguments and references.

### Immigration, Chinese and Japanese

The Adoption of the Provisions in the Immigration Law of 1924 for the Exclusion of the Japanese was the Best Policy. Carpenter. p. 48-56. Briefs and references.

Chinese and Japanese Immigration. Phelps. Vol. III. p. 147-89. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

Chinese, Exclusion of (U. S. A. and Australia.) Askew. p. 27-8. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Chinese Immigration. Library of Congress. Select List of References. 31p. 10c. 1904.

———. Mabie. Vol. II. p. 205-38. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 9-11. Arguments and references.

———. Thomas. p. 176. Arguments.

The Immigration Act of 1924 Should Be So Amended as to Admit Japanese on the Same Basis as Europeans. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 249-95. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Vol. XI. p. 75-119. Speeches, briefs and references.

Japanese and Chinese Should Be Admitted to Citizenship. Arnold. p. 257-9. References.

Johnsen. Japanese Exclusion. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 4.) 134p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. List of References on Japanese in America. 16p. Typew. 80c. 1916. (P. A. I. S.)

**Immigration, Chinese and Japanese—Continued**

Library of Congress. List of References on Japanese in America. 26p. Mim. November 20, 1920.

Montana. High School Debating League, 1921. p. 13-18. References.

Our Present Policy; Should It Be Modified. Ringwalt. p. 42-9. Briefs and references.

Phelps. Immigration. (Handbook Series.) p. 257-370. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

**Income Tax**

An Income Tax Should Be Continued in the Tax System of the United States. Carpenter. p. 198-200. Briefs and references.

———. Nichols. Vol. II. p. 1-123. Speeches and two debates, with references.

———. Pearson. p. 91-107. Summary of arguments and references.

———. Phelps. Income Tax. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 3d ed. xxxiii, 235p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o. p.

———. Thomas. p. 180. Arguments.

Library of Congress. Additional References Relating to the Taxation of Incomes. p. 87-144. 20c. 1911.

———. List of Recent References on Income Tax. 96p. pa. 20c. 1921.

———. List of References on Income-Tax Evasion. 4p. Typew. 50c. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of References on the Mellon Plan of Tax Reduction. 12p. Typew. \$1.30. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

———. Select List of References Relating to Taxation of Inheritances and of Incomes. 86p. 20c. 1907.

A Progressive Income Tax. Askew. p. 110-12. Affirmative and negative arguments. o. p.

The United States Should Now Abolish the Income Tax Policy of Taxation. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 223-6. Arguments and references.

**Income Tax. State**

Beman. Current Problems in Taxation. (Handbook Series.) p. 205-350. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. Brief Lists of References on State Taxation of Incomes. 3p. Typew. 40c. Mr. 7, '21. (P. A. I. S.)

**Indeterminate Sentence**

Indeterminate Sentence for the Professional Criminal. Askew. p. 76-7. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

**India. Home Rule**

Askew. p. 77-80. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

**Individual Liberty. See Liberty****Industrial Arbitration. See Arbitration, Industrial****Industrial Management. Employee Representation**

National Industrial Councils. Zimand. Modern Social Movements. p. 89-104. Bibliography. H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1921. o.p.

Phelps. Vol. VII. p. 295-336. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

Work Shop Committees: List of References. Special Libraries. 10:203-8. O. '19.

**Inheritance Tax**

The Federal Estate Tax Law of 1924 as Amended Should Have the Approval of the People of the Nation. Carpenter. p. 57-64. Briefs and references.

Library of Congress. Brief List of Recent References on Federal Inheritance Taxation. 4p. Typew. 50c. Ag 4, '21. (P. A. I. S.)

———. Select List of References Relating to Taxation of Inheritances and of Incomes. 86p. 20c. 1907.

Phelps. Vol. III. p. 227-70. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

Progressive Inheritance Tax Levied by the Federal Government. Pearson. p. 141-4. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 227-9. Arguments and references.

**Initiative and Referendum. See Referendum****Injunctions**

The Attitude of the Federal Courts toward the Use of the Writ of Injunction, as Indicated by the Bucks Stove and Range Company Decision, Is Conducive to the Best Interests of the People of the United States. Pearson. p. 127-37. Synopsis of debate and references.



**Injunctions—Continued**

Injunction in Labor Disputes. Nichols. Vol. V. p. 329-95. Speeches and references.

The Issuing of Injunctions by Federal Courts in Labor Disputes Should Be Forbidden by Congress. Ringwalt. p. 219-26. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 85-7. Arguments and references.

———. Thomas. p. 188. Arguments.

Library of Congress. Select List of References on Boycotts and Injunctions in Labor Disputes. 69p. 10c. 1911.

**Insanity and Crime**

The Plea of Temporary Insanity as a Defense in Crime Shall Be Abolished by Law. Phelps. Vol. XV. Chap. VI. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Installment Plan**

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on Business on the Instalment Plan (supplementary to the typewritten list, January 23, 1924). 4p. Typew. 50c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of References on Business on the Instalment Plan. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

Muller. Installment Buying. (Reference Shelf. Volume V. No. 8.) 120p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

The Practice of Installment Buying Should Be Drastically Curtailed. Phelps. Vol. XV. Chap. IV. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Insurance, Automobile**

Bowers. Compulsory Automobile Insurance. (Handbook Series. Ser. III. Vol. 2.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

New York (state). Library. Legislative Reference Section. Compulsory Automobile Insurance. W. E. Monk. 34p. Typew. \$3.10. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

**Insurance, Credit**

Library of Congress. List of References on Credit Insurance. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

**Insurance, Health**

Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) p. xxxv-xliv, 169-231. Selected articles and references.

**Insurance, Industrial**

Library of Congress. Industrial Insurance; a brief bibliographical list. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

**Insurance, Invalidity**

Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) p. xlvii-lviii, 243-96. Selected articles and references.

**Insurance, Marine**

Library of Congress. Marine Insurance: a Bibliographical List. 12p. Typew. \$1.30. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

**Insurance, Soldiers' and Sailors'**

Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) p. lxii-lxiv, 365-81. Selected articles and references.

**Insurance, State and Compulsory**

Bullock. Compulsory Insurance. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxxv,266p. References and selected articles.

Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) p. xxxiv-xxxv,111-68. Selected articles and references.

Library of Congress. Short List of References on Social Insurance. 9p. Typew. \$1. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

A Policy of Compulsory Old-Age Insurance Should Be Adopted by Our Federal Government. Nichols. Vol. IV. p. 377-413. Speeches and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 203-5. Arguments and references.

The Several States Should Adopt a System of Compulsory Industrial Insurance for Accident and Sickness Risks. Merry. 11p. Typew. 55c. 1916. (P. A. I. S.) Briefs and references.

The States Should Employ a System of Compulsory Industrial Insurance, Constitutionality Conceded. Mabie. Vol. II. p. 239-92. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

The United States Should Enact Legislation Embodying the Principles of the German Industrial Insurance Law for the Compensation of Industrial Accidents in this Country. Nichols. Vol. IV. p. 303-76. Speeches and references.

**Insurance, Title**

Library of Congress. List of References on Title Insurance. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

**Insurance, Unemployment**

Bullock. Compulsory Insurance. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxxv, 266p. References and selected articles.

Forsberg. Unemployment Insurance. (Handbook Series.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) p. liii-lix, 297-336. Selected articles and references.

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on Unemployment Insurance. 12p. mim. December 5, 1921.

———. List of References on Unemployment Insurance (supplementary to the mim. list of December 5, 1921.) 8p. mim. 1923.

Phelps. Vol. VIII. p. 53-105; Vol. IX. p. 1-52 (both o.p.); Vol. X. Chap. III. Speeches, briefs and references.

Wisconsin University Bulletin. 15c. Arguments and references.

**International Government**

Detroit, Michigan. Public Library. Civics Division. Selected List of References to Material on the Question Resolved: that an International Government Be Established. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

**International Police Force**

International Police to Enforce Treaties and Preserve Peace. Mabie. Vol. II. p. 1-42. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

**Intervention**

Beman. Intervention in Latin America. (Handbook Series. Ser. II. Vol. 5.) lii, 295p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

The Present Policy of the United States Government in Central America Should be Condemned. Phelps. Vol. XIV. p. 139-88. Speeches, briefs and references.

The United States Should Assume Responsibility for the Preservation of Law and Order in South America. Carpenter. p. 155-8. Briefs and references.

**Investments, Foreign**

Protection of Foreign Investments. Debaters Research. \$1.60. 1928. Arguments.

The United States Should Cease to Protect by Force of Arms Capital Invested in Foreign Lands Except After Formal Declaration of War. Nichols. Vol. IX. p. 381-453. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Vol. XIII. p. 147-209; Vol. XIV. p. 89-137. Speeches, briefs and references.

———. Winning Intercollegiate Debates and Orations. Vol. 2. p. 9-III. Two debates, briefs and references.

The United States Should Not Intervene to Preserve Order or Protect Elections in Pan-American Republics. Carpenter. p. 40-7. Briefs and references.

### **Investment Banking**

Library of Congress. Investment Banking: a Bibliographical List. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

### **Ireland, Independence**

Askew. p. 85-9; Home Rule. p. 89-90; Separate Ulster from the Rest of Ireland. p. 90-2. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Phelps. Vol. VII. p. 337-82. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

### **Judges**

Library of Congress. The Federal Judiciary: a List of Recent Writings. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

### **Judges. Election**

Beman. Election vs. Appointment of Judges. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 2.) 171p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. List of References on the Election Versus Appointment of Judges. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of References on the Popular Election of Supreme Court Judges, State and Federal. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

### **Jugoslavia**

Stanoyevich. Slavonic Nations of Yesterday and Today. (Handbook Series.) p. xxxv-xlii, 323-82. References and selected articles.

**Jury System**

Askew. p. 93-5. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

In All Trials Thruout the United States a Judge or a Board of Judges Should Be Substituted for the Jury. Phelps. Vol. XV. Chap. VII. Speeches, briefs and references.

In the State (of New York), a Unanimous Verdict Should no Longer Be Required in Jury Trials. Thomas. p. 194. Arguments.

Johnsen. Jury System. (Reference Shelf. Vol. V. No. 6.) 176p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

The Jury System Should Be Abolished in the United States. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 30-1. Arguments and references.

Kirby. Criminal Justice. (Handbook Series.) p. xxix-xxx, 119-25, 201-24. References and selected articles.

Library of Congress. Brief List of References on Women as Jurors. 2p. Typew. 30c. February 24, 1923. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of Recent References on the Jury System. 5p. Typew. 60c. March 3, 1923. (P. A. I. S.)

Three-fourths Decision in Jury Trials. Nichols. Vol. III. p. 311-37. Report of debate, with references.

———. Phelps. Vol. XIV. p. 293-346. Speeches, briefs and references.

Trial by Jury: Pro and Con. Debaters Research. 80c. 1929. Arguments.

**Kansas Court of Industrial Relations**

Johnsen. Kansas Court of Industrial Relations. (Reference Shelf. Vol. I. No. 4.) 71p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library Journal. p. 887-9. November 1, 1920. References.

Phelps. Vol. VII. p. 105-39; Vol. VIII. p. 1-52. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

U. S. Dept. of Labor. Library. List of References on the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations; comp. by Laura A. Thompson. 10p. mim. February 24, 1921.

———. Supplementary List of References on the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations; comp. by Laura A. Thompson. 5p. Mim. January 19, 1922.

The Various States of the Union Should Establish Industrial Courts Similar to the One in Operation in Kansas. Robbins. p. 53-8. Briefs and references.

*See also Strikes*

**Ku Klux Klan**

Arnold. p. 298-300. References.

Johnsen. Ku Klux Klan. (Reference Shelf. Vol. I. No. 10.) 105p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. List of References on the Ku Klux Klan. 10p. Typew. \$1.60. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

———. Select List of References on Ku Klux Klan. 8p. Typew. 90c. June 20, 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

**Labor and Laboring Classes**

Library of Congress. List of Recent Publications on Various Aspects of the Labor Problem. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

**Labor Banks.** *See* Banks and Banking, Trade Union

**Labor Contracts**

The Contract System of Employing Labor Should Be Abolished. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 41-2. Arguments and references.

**Labor Parties**

Library of Congress. Brief List of References on Labor in Politics and Labor Parties. 6p. Typew. 70p. December 16, 1922. (P. A. I. S.)

**Labor Party (United States)**

Phelps. Vol. IX. p. 331-73. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

**Labor Unions.** *See* Trade Unions

**Land Titles**

The Torrens System of Land-Title Registration Should Be Adopted Throughout the United States. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 230-2. Arguments and references.

**Latin Language, Study**

Beman. Study of Latin and Greek. (Handbook Series.) li, 237p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

**League of Nations**

Arizona. University. Library. The League of Nations; a Selected List of References on the Question; Resolved, That the United States Should Join the League of Nations; Prepared for the Arizona State High School Debating League. J. G. Hodgson. 15p. Typew. \$1.60. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

**League of Nations—Continued**

Askew. p. 99-102. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p. Bringing the World to America. p. 1-2. References.

Brooklyn. (N.Y.) Public Library. Bulletin. 2: 133-6. My. '19. References.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. League of Nations: Select List of References. 6p. mim. 1923.

Johnsen. League of Nations. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 3.) 121p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

———. National Defense. Vol. III. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) p. lix-lx, 253-79. References and selected articles. o.p.

League of Nations: Outlines for Discussion. 11p. pa. National Committee on the Churches and the Moral Aims of the War. 70 5th Avenue, New York.

Library of Congress. League of Nations: a Short List of Recent Writings. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

North Carolina. University Bulletin. December 16, 1921. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Oklahoma University Bulletin. Exten. Ser. No. 49. My. 1, '19. Selected arguments, also a draft of the revised covenant.

Phelps. League of Nations. (Handbook Series.) 4th ed. xxxix, 326p. References and selected articles. Out of print.

———. Vol. IX. p. 283-329 (o.p.); Vol. X. Chap. V. Speeches, briefs and references.

Publications issued by the League of Nations: Catalog of the World Peace Foundation. 40 Mt. Vernon St., Boston.

Recent Magazine Articles and Pamphlets on World Court, League of Nations and Outlawry of War. 2p. National Council for Prevention of War. 532 17th St., Washington, D. C. 1924.

St. Louis Public Library. Bulletin. p. 65. February, 1919. References.

This House Upholds America's Refusal to Enter the League of Nations. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 299-354. Speeches and references.

United States Should Enter the League of Nations. Carpenter. p. 88-95. Briefs and references.

———. Robbins. p. 187-94. Briefs and references.

Wisconsin University. Bulletin. Ser. No. 970. 10c. Affirmative and negative arguments and references.

**League to Enforce Peace**

League of Nations to Enforce Peace. Phelps. Vol. IV. p. 107-46. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

Library of Congress. List of References on a League to Enforce Peace. 3p. Typew. 15c. 1916. (P. A. I. S.)

**Legislatures**

Library of Congress. List of References on One Chamber and Two Chamber Legislatures. 3p. Typew. 15c. 1916. (P. A. I. S.)

Unicameral Legislature for State Governments. Nichols. Vol. V. p. 279-327. Speeches and references.

**Liberty**

Phelps. Civil Liberty. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 9.) 194p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

The Present Governmental Tendency to Restrict Personal Liberty Should Be Condemned. Nichols. Vol. IX. p. 253-316. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Vol. XII. p. 143-93. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Lynching**

Congress May Legislate under the Fourteenth Amendment to Punish Lynching. (*In* Ringwalt, R. C. Brief Drawing. p. 197-214. Longmans. New York. 1923). Affirmative brief.

Library of Congress. List of References on Lynch Law. 17p. Typew. \$1.80. Jl. 9, 1921. (P. A. I. S.)

The Negro and Lynching. *In* Work, M. N. Bibliography of the Negro in Africa and America. p. 550-9. \$12. H. W. Wilson Co. N.Y. 1928.

**Marriage, Companionate**

New York (state). Library. Legislative Reference Section. References on Companionate Marriage, 1928. 1p. Typew. 20c. (P.A.I.S.)

**Marriage Laws**

Congress Should Enact a Uniform Marriage and Divorce Law, Constitutionality Conceded. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 391-458. Speeches and references.

The Federal Constitution Should Be Amended Granting Congress the Exclusive Power to Enact Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws in the United States. Phelps. Vol. XI. p. 121-73. Speeches, briefs and references.



**Marriage Laws—Continued**

Johnsen. Marriage and Divorce. (Handbook Series.) li, 293p. Briefs and selected articles.

The United States Should Have Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 12-13. Arguments and references.

*See also* Divorce

**Maternity Benefits**

Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) p. xlv-xlvii, 233-42. Selected articles and references.

**Mayors**

The Executive Appointments of a City Mayor Should Not Require Council Confirmation. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 104-5. Arguments and references.

**Mencken School of Thought**

The School of Thought Typified by Mencken is a Harmful Element in American Life. Phelps. Vol. XI. p. 277-319. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Merchant Marine**

Arnold. p. 283-5. References.

Foreign-built Ships Should Be Admitted to American Registry Free of Duty. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 191-3. Arguments and references.

Government-owned Merchant Marine. Independent. 81:210. F. 8, '15. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

———. Nichols. Vol. VI. p. 199-243. Speeches and references.

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 46-7. References.

Library of Congress. Brief List of References on the Merchant Marine of Great Britain and the United States. 4p. Typew. 20c. 1919. (P. A. I. S.)

Phelps. American Merchant Marine. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. xxxviii, 344p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

**Metric System**

Hildebrand, Clifton, comp. Metric Literature Clues; a list of references. 64p. pa. World Trade Club. 681 Market St., San Francisco.

Johnsen. Metric System. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 8.)  
111p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Special Libraries. 13: 1-16. Ja. '22. References.

### **Mexicans in the United States**

Library of Congress. Mexican Labor in the United States:  
a Brief Bibliographical List. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

### **Mexico. Annexation**

The Annexation of Mexico to the United States Would Be  
for the Best Interests of Both Countries. Shurter. Both Sides.  
p. 49-51. Arguments and references.

### **Mexico. Intervention**

The United States Should Intervene in Mexico. Independent.  
76:268. N. 6, '13. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides:  
Briefs for Debate.

### **Military Service**

Askew. p. 155-8. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Compulsory Military Service. Nichols. Vol. VI. p. 315-77.  
Speeches and references.

———. Swiss System. Nichols. Vol. VII. p. 1-41.  
Speeches and references.

———. Van Valkenburgh. National Defense. Vol. II.  
Including Compulsory Military Service. (Debaters' Handbook  
Series). Briefs, p. xiii-xvii. References, p. xliii-liv. Selected  
articles, p. 107-204. o.p.

Johnsen. National Defense. Vol. III. (Debaters' Hand-  
book Series.) p. liv-lviii, 207-51. References and selected  
articles. o.p.

Library of Congress. List of References on the Austra-  
lian Military System. 3p. Typew. 15c. 1917. (P. A. I. S.)

Mabie. Vol. II. p. 79-96. Speeches, briefs and references.  
o.p.

Universal Military Service. Independent. 90:41+ Ap. 2 '17.  
Briefs and references.

———. Phelps. Vol. III. p. 53-98. Speeches, briefs and  
references. Out of print.

### **Military Training**

Beman. Military Training Compulsory in Schools and Col-  
leges. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 3.) 161p. Briefs, refer-  
ences and selected articles.

**Military Training—Continued**

Johnsen. National Defense. Vol III. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) p. xli-liv, 121-206. References and selected articles. o.p.

Library of Congress. List of References on a Reserve Army and on the Military Training of Civilians. 4p. Typew. 20c. 1915. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of References on Military Education in Schools, Colleges and Universities. 6p. Typew. 30c. 1916. (P. A. I. S.)

Military Training Should Be Given in American Colleges and Universities. Independent. 82:92. Ap. 12, '15. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

Nichols. Vol. VII. p. 36-41. References.

Oklahoma University Bulletin. Extra. Ser. No. 54.

Students Attending Universities and Colleges Should Be Compelled to Take Military Training. Robbins. p. 81-6. Briefs and references.

Van Valkenburgh. Compulsory Military Training. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 50+ 208p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

Washington. Interscholastic High School Debate. November, 1917. 11p. Arguments and references.

**Minimum Wage**

Compulsory Minimum Wage Laws. Mabie. Vol. I. p. 261-386. Reports of debates, briefs and references. Out of print.

Laws Establishing a Minimum Wage Should Be Enacted in the United States. Craig and Edgerton. p. 551-3. Outlines.

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on the Minimum Wage Question. Typew. \$1.30. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of Recent References on the Minimum Wage Question. Typew. \$1.30. March 24, 1923. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of References on the Minimum Wage Question. 12p. Typew. 60c. 1917. (P.A.I.S.)

Minimum Wage for the Sweated Industries of the United States. Nichols. Vol. III. p. 81-184. Speeches of two debates and references.

Nichols. Vol. VI. p. 69-153. Speeches and references.

Phelps. Vol. IV. p. 237-74. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

Reely. Minimum Wage. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxvi, 202p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

State and Federal Government Should Pass a Minimum Wage Law Affecting All Types of Employment. Montana High School Debating League, 1919. p. 17-20. References.

Through Appropriate Legislation a Minimum Wage Scale Should Be Put in Operation in the Several States. Arnold. p. 313-15. References.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 182-4. Arguments and references.

United States. Dept. of Labor. Women's Bureau. List of References on Minimum Wage for Women in United States and Canada; comp. by Edna L. Stone. (Bull. 42) v, 42p. 10c. 1925.

The United States Should Enact Minimum Wage Legislation. Independent. 80:409. D. 14, '14. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

Wages Boards. Askew. p. 257-9. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

**Modernism.** See Fundamentalist Controversy

### Monroe Doctrine

Askew. p. 107-8. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Library of Congress. List of References on International Arbitration. 20c. 1908.

———. List of References on the Monroe Doctrine. 122p. 15c. 1919.

The Monroe Doctrine Should Be Continued as a Part of the Permanent Foreign Policy of the United States. Phelps. Monroe Doctrine. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. xxxiii, 337p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

———. Ringwalt. p. 84-92. Briefs and references.

———. Thomas. p. 198. Arguments.

Nichols. Vol. V. p. 1-52. Speeches and references.

Oklahoma University Bulletin. Exten. Ser. No. 28. O. 15, '18. References and selected articles for both sides.

The United States Should Resist by Force, if Need Be, the

The United States Should Discontinue Its Monroe Doctrine Policy. Arnold. p. 263-6. References.

———. Independent. 77:310. Mr. 2, '14. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

**Monroe Doctrine—Continued**

The United States Should Discontinue Its Monroe Doctrine Policy. Mabie. Vol. I. p. 181-259. Reports of debates and references. Out of print.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 55-7. Arguments and references.

The United States Should Resist by Force, if Need Be, the Colonization of South America by any European Nation. Thomas. p. 192. Arguments.

**Mormons**

The Practices and Policies of the Mormon Church Should Be Further Restricted by the Federal Government. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 197-9. Arguments and references.

**Mother's Day**

Library of Congress. Mother's Day: a Brief Bibliographical List. 4p. Typew. 50c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

**Mothers' Pensions**

Bullock. Mothers' Pensions. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xviii, 188p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

Library of Congress. List of References on Mothers' Pensions. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Pensions Should Be Paid from State Funds to Mothers of Dependent Children. Arnold. p. 309-11. References.

———. Independent. 80:206. N. 9, '14. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

Relief for Widows and Orphans. Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) p. lix-lxii, 337-64. Selected articles and references.

**Moving Pictures**

Censorship. Askew. p. 24. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on the Moving Picture Industry. 4p. Typew. 20c. 1917. (P. A. I. S.)

Motion Picture Theatres Offer a Desirable Amusement. Independent. 89:426-7. Mr. 5, '17. Briefs and references.

Moving Pictures Should be Suppressed. Arnold. p. 311-13. References.

New York (state). Library. Legislative Ref. Sec. Censorship of Movies, Magazines and Books. 9p. Typew. \$1. February, 1924. (P. A. I. S.)

Rutland. State Censorship of Moving Pictures. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 1.) 177p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

**Municipal Government.** *See* City Manager Plan; Commission Government, Cities; Municipal Home Rule

### **Municipal Home Rule**

Beman. Municipal Government. (Handbook Series.) Part IV. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Wisconsin University Bulletin. 5c. Arguments and references.

### **Municipal Ownership**

Cities Should Own and Control All the Public Franchises Now Conferred upon Corporations. Craig and Edgerton. p. 337-50. Outlines.

For American Cities, Municipal Ownership of those Public-Service Corporations Which Furnish Water, Light, and Transportation, Is Preferable to Private Ownership. Robbins. p. 128-40. Briefs and references.

Johnsen. Municipal Ownership. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 3d ed. xxxiv,334p. Briefs, references and articles. o.p.

Library of Congress. Brief List of References on Municipal Ownership of Public Utilities. 10p. mim. February 26, 1923.

Municipal Ownership and Operation of Public Utilities Is Desirable. Carpenter. p. 115-20. Briefs and references.

Municipalities Should Own and Control the Natural Monopolies. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 67-8. Arguments and references.

Street Railways Should Be Owned and Operated by Municipalities. Ringwalt. p. 184-93. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 106-8. Arguments and references.

### **Muscle Shoals Project**

Henry Ford Should Be Permitted to Take Over the Muscle Shoals Project. Arnold. p. 294-6. References.

Library of Congress. List of References on the Muscle Shoals Nitrate Plant. 8p. Typew. 90c. March 1, 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

**Mussolini, Benito**

This House Endorses the Governmental Policies of Mussolini. Nichols. Vol. IX. p. 197-251. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Vol. XIII. p. 317-67. Speeches, briefs and references.

**National Defense (United States)**

Bacon. National Defense. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxix,234p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

Johnsen. National Defense. Vol. III. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) lx,279p. Briefs, references and articles. o.p.

———. National Defense. (Handbook Series. Ser. II. Vol. 6.) lxxxiii,469p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

———. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 32-4. References.

Library of Congress. Brief List of Books on National Defense. 9p. Typew. \$1. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Our National Defenses Should Be Kept on a Par with Those of the Other Leading Nations, Including an Army and Navy Equal to Those of Any Other Power. Arnold. p. 266-8. References.

Preparedness. Literary Digest. 52: 509-10. F. 26, '16. Briefs and references.

———. Mabie. Vol. II. p. 43-77. Report of debate, briefs and references. o.p.

Van Valkenburgh. National Defense. Vol. II. Including Compulsory Military Service. liv,204p. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

*See also* Air Service (United States); Army (United States). Increase; Navy (United States). Increase

**Naturalization**

The Naturalization Laws of the United States Should Be Made More Stringent. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 14-15. Arguments and references.

**Navy (United States). Increase**

Bacon. National Defense. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxix,243p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

Fanning. Enlargement of the United States Navy. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 3d ed. viii,138p. Selected articles. Out of print.

Increase of the Army and Navy. Mabie. Vol. I. p. 1-180. Reports of debates and references. Out of print.

Johnsen. National Defense. Vol. III. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) p. xxxvii-xli, 85-119. References and selected articles. o.p.

Library of Congress. List of References on Naval Disarmament. 5p. Typew. 60c. Mr. 30, '21. (P. A. I. S.)

Navy for Police Duty Only. Phelps. Vol. VIII. p. 251-82. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

The Navy Should Be Enlarged. Lyon. p. 126-7. Arguments and references.

———. Pearson. p. 293-302. Report of debate and references.

———. Shurter Both Sides. p. 18-19. Arguments and references.

———. Thomas. p. 176. Arguments.

Nichols. Vol. VII. p. 337-83. Speeches.

Preparedness. Carpenter. p. 230-8. Briefs and references.

———. Literary Digest. 52:509-10. F. 26, '16. Briefs and references.

———. Mabie. Vol. II. p. 43-77. Report of debate, briefs and references. o.p.

Shall We Increase Our Army and Navy? Wisconsin University Bulletin. 10c. Two papers. o.p.

There Should Be a Material Increase in the Armament of the United States. Shurter. How to Debate. p. 270-300. Specimen debate. o.p.

## Negroes

Library of Congress. List of Books on the Negro Question, 1915-1926. 10p. Typew. \$1.10. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of References on Negro Migration. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of References on Negro Segregation in the United States. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

Negro in Industry: Selected Bibliography; comp. by H. L. Pier and M. L. Spalding. (1)+216-44p. 1926. (Reprinted from the Monthly Labor Review. Ja. 1926.)

Work, M. N. Bibliography of the Negro in Africa and America. \$12. H. W. Wilson Co. N.Y. 1928.



### Negro Suffrage

The Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution Should Be Repealed. Carpenter. p. 189-93. Briefs and references.

———. Ringwalt. p. 17-24. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 109-11. Arguments and references.

Johnsen. Negro problem. (Handbook Series.) p. xxix-xxxii, 199-243. References and selected articles.

Library of Congress. Lists of Discussions of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, with Special Reference to Negro Suffrage. 18p. 10c. 1906.

The Methods by which the Negroes in the Southern States Are Excluded from the Franchise Are Justifiable. Thomas. p. 168. Arguments and references.

Negroes and Civil Rights in Law and Practice. *In* Work, M. N. Bibliography of the Negro in Africa and America. p. 533-42. \$12. H. W. Wilson Co. N.Y. References.

The Representation in Congress of those States Restricting the Elective Franchise Should Be Reduced in Accordance with the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution. Carpenter. p. 194-7. Briefs and references.

### Newspapers

The Power of the Press Has Increased, Is Increasing, and Should Be Diminished. Phelps. Vol. XIV. p. 189-238. Speeches, briefs and references.

### Non-Resistance

Parsons. Non-Resistance. (Abridged Debaters' Handbook Series.) 93p. Briefs, references and articles. o.p.

The Principle of Non-Resistance Should Govern the Foreign Policy of the United States. Independent. 89:40. Ja. 1, '17. Briefs and references.

### Old Age Pensions

Askew. p. 163-5. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Bernan. Old Age Pensions. (Handbook Series. Ser. II. Vol. 1.) lxxii, 359p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Bullock. Compulsory Insurance. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxxv, 266p. References and selected articles.

Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) p. xlvii-liv, 243-87. Selected articles and references.

Library of Congress. Select List of References on Old Age and Civil Service Pensions. 20p. Typew. \$1. 1916. (P. A. I. S.)

———. Some Recent References on Retirement Allowances. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Monthly Labor Review. 22:1414-22. Je. 1926. Public Old Age Pensions in the United States: List of References; comp. by Edna L. Stone.

A System of Old Age Pensions Should Be Established in the United States. Robbins. p. 33-44. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides p. 200-2. Arguments and references.

———. Thomas. p. 192. Arguments.

### Open and Closed Shop

Beman. The Closed Shop. (Handbook Series.) 2d ed. rev. and enl. xlvii, 282p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Bowers, Edison L. and Buehler, Alfred G., comps. Closed Union Shop is Justifiable. 3d ed. rev. 47p. pa. 40c. Published by the Compilers, Tiffin, Ohio. 1922. Arguments for the affirmative, and references.

Closed Shop. Phelps. Vol VI. p. 247-92; Vol. VIII. p. 335-439. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

The Closed Shop Should Be Universally Adopted. Arnold. p. 281-2. References.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 211-13. Arguments and references.

The Closed Shop Would Benefit the American People as a Whole. North Dakota. University. Departmental Bulletin, July, 1922. References.

Employers of Labor Are Justified in Insisting on the "Open" Shop. Thomas. p. 194. Arguments.

In Labor Disputes Workmen Are Justified in Demanding as a Condition of Settlement that Their Employers Agree to Employ only Members of Trade Unions. Pearson. p. 261-90. Report of debate and references.

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 8. References.

The Movement of Organized Labor for the Closed Shop Should Receive the Support of Public Opinion. Nichols. Vol. III. p. 185-238. Speeches and references.

**Open and Closed Shop—Continued**

Open Shop: Debate. Andrew Furuseth vs. Walter G. Merritt. New York. March 13, 1921. 47p. pa. 50c. H. W. Wilson Co. New York. o.p.

Open Shop. Oklahoma University Bulletin. Exten. Ser. No. 64.

———. Phelps. Vol. VII. p. 1-53. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

**Pact of Paris**

Gerould. Pact of Paris. (Handbook Series. Ser. III. Vol. 1.) xiv, 287p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

The United States Should Ratify the Pact of Paris Without Reservations. Phelps. Vol. XV. Chap. I. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Panama. Independence**

Carpenter. p. 167-70. Briefs and references.

**Panama Canal. Tolls**

Phelps. Panama Canal Tolls. (Abridged Debaters' Handbook Series.) 50p. Briefs, references and articles. o.p.

The Provision of the Panama Canal Act Exempting Coast-wise Shipping of the United States from the Payment of Tolls Should Be Repealed. Independent. 74:1193-5. My. 29, '13. Briefs and references.

**Parcels Post**

The Parcels Post System Should Be More Extensively Adopted in the United States. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 22-3. Arguments and references.

**Parliamentary System.** See Cabinet System of Government

**Peace**

Bibliography on War and the Peace Movement. 4p. mim. National Council for Prevention of War. 532 17th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 1924.

France Can Exert Greater Influence for World Peace Thru Regional Arrangements such as the Locarno Pacts than Thru World Associations such as the League of Nations. Phelps. Vol. XIV. p. 347-93. Speeches, briefs and references.

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 29-31. References.

Library of Congress. List of References on International Arbitration. 20c. 1908.

———. Renunciation of War: a Bibliographical List. 12p. Typew. \$1.30. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

The Proposals of the Allies in Their Reply to President Wilson Should Be the Basis of the Terms of Peace Which Will End the Great War. Independent. 89:240. F. 5, '17. Briefs and references.

Reely. World Peace, Including International Arbitration and Disarmament. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. xxiv, 256p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

*See also* Pamphlet series issued by the World Peace Foundation, 29A Beacon St., Boston, Mass. Write for list of publications

*See also* Disarmament; League of Nations; League to Enforce Peace; War

### Pensions

The Pension Policy of the United States Is not Justified. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 100-1. Arguments and references.

### Permanent Court of International Justice

Bringing the World to America. p. 2-3. References.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Select List of References on the Permanent Court of International Justice. 5p. mim. 1923.

Johnsen. Permanent Court of International Justice. (Reference Shelf. V. II. No. 2.) 118p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Library of Congress. List of References on International Courts, with Special Reference to the Permanent Court of International Justice. 27p. mim. 1923.

———. Permanent Court of International Justice: References Supplementing Previous Lists. 10p. Mim. 1929. (P.A.I.S.)

Phelps. Vol. X. Chap. VIII. Speeches, briefs and references.

Recent Magazine Articles and Pamphlets on World Court, League of Nations and Outlawry of War. 2p. National Council for Prevention of War. 532 17th St., Washington, D. C. 1924.

**Permanent of Court of International Justice—Continued**

The United States Should Become a Member of the Permanent Court of International Justice. Montana. High School Debating League, 1924. p. 17-20. References.

The United States Should Take an Active Part in Supporting a World Court. Arnold. p. 270-2. References.

The World Court. North Carolina. University Extension Division Bulletin. Vol. VIII. No. 5. November 1, 1928. Articles and references.

**Philippine Islands. Independence**

Arnold. Chap. V. Brief, references and arguments.

Ball. Independence for the Philippines. (Reference Shelf. Vol. V. No. 3.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

It Would Be Advisable for Our Government to Grant Absolute Independence to the People of the Philippine Islands. Craig and Edgerton. p. 462-85. Discussions.

Library of Congress. List of Works Relating to the American Occupation of the Philippine Islands, 1898-1903. 100p. 25c. 1905.

Nichols. Vol. V. p. 219-77. Speeches and references.

Phelps. Vol. VIII. p. 157-204. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

The Philippine Islands Should Be Given Absolute Independence. Carpenter. p. 138-42. Briefs and references.

The United States Should Permanently Retain the Philippine Islands. Ringwalt. p. 75-83. Briefs and references.

———. Robbins. p. 141-53. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 52-4. Arguments and references.

The United States Should Within the Next Four Years Grant the Philippines Their Independence. Independent. 85:344. Mr. 6, '16. Briefs and references.

**Poland**

Stanoyevich. Slavonic Nations of Yesterday and Today. (Handbook Series.) p. xxvi-xxx, 203-65. References and selected articles.

**Political Parties**

Conservative and Liberal Parties for the United States. Phelps. Vol. X. Chap. VII. Speeches, briefs and references.

The Formation of a Separate Political Party Would Be for the Best Interests of the Laboring Class. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 4-5. Arguments and references.

Hodgson. Labor Party for the United States. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 2.) 109p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. List of References on the National Committees of Political Parties. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

The Progressive Party Deserves the Support of the American People. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 6-8. Arguments and references.

**Port Terminals.** *See* Terminals

### **Postal Rates**

The United States Should Adopt Penny Postage. Craig and Edgerton. p. 86-93. Arguments.

### **Postal Savings**

It Is not Good Policy for the Government of the United States to Establish a System of Postal Savings. Craig and Edgerton. p. 286-315. Discussions.

### **Postal Service**

Library of Congress. List of References on the Franking Privilege. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

### **President. Election**

Arnold. p. 302-3. References.

The President of the United States Should Be Elected by a Direct Vote of the People. Carpenter. p. 175-80. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 95-7. Arguments and references.

Presidential Electors Should Be Chosen by Districts Instead of on a General Ticket. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 98-9. Arguments and references.

### **President. Term of Office**

Phelps. Single Six-Year Term for President. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 3.) 112p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

**Presidential System.** *See* Cabinet System of Government Press. *See* Newspapers

### Price Fixing

The Manufacturer of a Trade-marked Article Should Have the Right to Maintain Its Retail Price. Independent. 78:139. Ap. 20, '14. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

### Prices. Government Regulation

Government Regulation of Prices before 1800 A. D. Special Libraries. 12:50-2. Mr. '21. References.

Library of Congress. List of References on Government Regulation of Prices. 5p. Typew. 25c. 1917. (P. A. I. S.)

Phelps. Vol. IV. p. 55-106. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

### Primaries

All Officers Should Be Elected by Direct Primaries. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 158-60. Arguments and references.

All State Elective Officers Should Be Nominated by the Direct Primary. Nichols. Vol. III. p. 41-79. Speeches (affirmative), summary (negative), and references.

Beman. Direct Primary. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 6.) 194p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

The Direct Primary Is the Preferable Method for Selecting Candidates to Office. Arnold. p. 303-5. References.

Fanning. Direct Primaries. (Debater's Handbook Series.) 4th ed. xxxiv, 228p. Briefs, references and articles. o.p.

Party Candidates for State, County and City Elective Offices and for the State and National Legislatures Should Be Nominated by a Direct Vote. Carpenter. p. 181-4. Briefs and references.

The Party Nominee for President Should Be Nominated by a Federal Primary Without Regard to State Lines. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 161-3. Arguments and references.

State, District, County, and City Officers Should Be Nominated by Direct Primaries. Robbins. p. 154-65. Briefs and references.

The System of Primary Election for State and National Offices Shall Be Abandoned. Phelps. Vol. XIV. p. 39-88. Speeches, briefs and references.

Wisconsin. Legislative Reference Library. References to Recent Material on the Direct Primary. 2p. Typew. 30c. January 24, 1922. (P.A.I.S.)

———. Selected List of References to Material in the Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library on the Operation of the Primary Elections. Beatrice Hager, comp. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

**Prison Labor.** *See* Convict Labor

### **Prison Reform**

Askew. p. 134-6. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Bacon. Prison Reform. (Handbook Series.) xxxvi,309p. References and selected articles.

Library of Congress. Prison Reform: Recent References. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

Wisconsin. University. Library School. References. 17p. Typew. 85c. 1916. (P. A. I. S.)

### **Profit Sharing**

Askew. p. 137-9. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

### **Prohibition**

Beman. Prohibition. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. lxiv,204p. Briefs, references and selected articles. Out of print.

———. Prohibition: Modification of the Volstead Law. (Handbook Series). Briefs, references and selected articles.

———. Prohibition: Modification of the Volstead Law: Sup. to Handbook of same title. (Reference Shelf. Vol. V. No. 1.) 154p. References and selected articles.

The Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Should Be Repealed. Carpenter. p. 65-74. Briefs and references.

———. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 3-42. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Vol. XIII. p. 95-145. Speeches, briefs and references.

———. Robbins. p. 166-72. Briefs and references.

Gillett vs. Holmes: debate. Repeal of the Prohibition Amendment. (Reference Shelf. Vol. I. No. 11.) Speeches. o.p.

The Gothenburg System of Eliminating Private Profits Offers the Best Solution of the Liquor Problem. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 24-5. Arguments and references.



**Prohibition—Continued**

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 19-20. References.

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on Prohibition. 9p. Typew. \$1. Ap. 6, '21. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of Recent References on the 18th Amendment and Its Enforcement (supplementary to typewritten list, October 26, 1922.) 9p. Typew. \$1. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

———. Prohibition: List of Recent Books. 4p. Typew. 50c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

Local Option. Askew. p. 102. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

———. Lyon. p. 127-8. Arguments and references.

Local Option Is the Most Satisfactory Method of Dealing with the Liquor Problem. Thomas. p. 184. Argument.

The Manufacture, Importation and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors for Beverage Purposes Should Be Forbidden by an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Independent. 88·432. D. 4, '16. Briefs and references.

The National Prohibition Act, in Title II, Section 1, Should Be Amended to Define Intoxicating Liquors as those Containing 2.75 Per Centum or More of Alcohol by Volume. Phelps. Vol. XI. p. 321-06. Speeches, briefs and references.

Prohibition Is a Better Solution of Our Liquor Problem than High License. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 26-7. Arguments and references.

Prohibition Law Should Be Revised to Legalize Beer and Light Wines. Phelps. Vol. IX. p. 191-235. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

The Sale, Manufacture and Importation of Alcoholic Liquors Should Be Prohibited in the United States by Constitutional Amendment. Mabie. Vol. II. p. 179-204. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

State Purchase of the Liquor Traffic. Askew. p. 177-8. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

This House Favors the Legalization of Light Wines and Beers Only. Nichols. Vol. IX. p. 79-149. Speeches and references.

Total Abstinence. Askew. p. 1-2. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

The United States Should Continue the Policy of Prohibition as Defined in the Eighteenth Amendment. Holmes vs. Darrow. Debate. 74p. \$1. League for Public Discussion. N.Y. 1924.

**Propaganda.** *See* Radical Propaganda

### **Proportional Representation**

Askew. p. 139-41. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Beman. Proportional Representation. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III, No. 5.) 149p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Legislative Bodies Should Be Chosen by a System of Proportional Representation. Ringwalt. p. 59-66. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 122-3. Arguments and references.

———. Thomas. p. 168. Arguments and references.

**Protection (Tariff).** *See* Free Trade and Protection

### **Public Defender**

American Journal of Criminal Law. February, 1924. p. 556-72. References.

The Office of Public Defender Should Be Created Thruout the United States. Independent. 85 : 140. Ja. 24, '16. Briefs and references.

Rhode Island. Legislative Reference Bureau. Library. 99p. Typew. \$1. Mr. 1, 1922. (P.A.I.S.)

### **Public Utilities. Municipal Ownership**

Library of Congress. List of Recent references on Municipal Ownership of Public Utilities. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

### **Public Utilities. Taxation**

Library of Congress. List of References on Taxation of Public Utilities. 7p. Typew. 80c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

### **Quarantine**

There Should Be Federal Control of Quarantine. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 71-2. Arguments and references.

### **Race Problems**

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 12-13. References.

**Race Problems—Continued**

Library of Congress. List of References on Race Problems. 199. Typew. \$2. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

Race Problem in the United States. *In* Work, M. N. Bibliography of the Negro in Africa and America. p. 588-611. \$12. H. W. Wilson Co. N.Y. 1928. References.

The Rapid Awakening of the Mongolian Race is Perilous to the Caucasian Supremacy of the World. Robbins. p. 195-204. Briefs and references.

**Radical Propaganda**

Suppression of Propaganda for the Overthrow of the United States Government. Phelps. Vol. VI. p. 293-373. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

**Railroads**

Cummins Plan for the Control of Railroads. Phelps. Vol. VI. p. 59-110. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

Plumb Plan. Zimand. Modern Social Movements. p. 105-112. Bibliography. H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1921. o.p.

*See also* Arbitration, Industrial; Government Ownership—Railroads

**Railroads. Rates**

Railways Should Be Allowed to Enter Into Pools and Rate Agreements under Supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 233-5. Arguments and references.

**Railway Labor Board**

Beman. Enforcement of the Decisions of the Railway Labor Board. (Reference Shelf. Vol. 1. No. 7.) 84p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Bureau of Railway Economics. Library. List of References on the Question of Giving to the Railroad Labor Board the Power to Enforce Its Decisions. rev. 15p. pa. Washington, D. C. December 20, 1922.

The Railway Labor Board Should Have Compulsory Power to Enforce Its Decisions. Arnold. p. 288-90. References.

**Recall**

Askew. p. 148-9. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.  
Bulletin of Bibliography. 7:5-8. Ap. '12. Recall of Public Officials. Charles W. Reeder. References.

Library of Congress. Select List of References on the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. 102p. 15c. 1912.

———. List of Recent References on the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1924. (P. A. I. S.)

New York (state). Library. Legislative Ref. Sec. Bibliography of Books and Articles on Initiative, Referendum and Recall, 1921-1924. E. N. Snow. 13p. Typew. \$1.40. 1924. (P. A. I. S.)

Phelps. Recall, including Recall of Judges and Judicial Decisions. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. 1,273p. References and selected articles.

Wisconsin University Bulletin. 5c. Arguments and references.

### Recall of Judges

Arnold. p. 305-7. References.

Judicial Officers Should Be Made Subject to Recall. Carpenter. p. 224-9. Briefs and references.

Nichols. Vol. II. p. 365-409. Outlines, speeches and references.

North Carolina University Record. January, 1914. p. 13-17. Briefs and references. o.p.

Phelps. Recall, including Recall of Judges and Judicial Decisions. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. 1,273p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Shurter. Both Sides. p. 246-8. Arguments and references.

Speaker. Vol. VII. p. 301-11. Outlines of speeches with references.

### Recall of Judicial Decisions

New England Triangular League. Courts and Social Reform. 67p. \$1. Report of 1913 debate, with references. H.W. Wilson. New York. o.p.

Judicial Decisions Should Be Subject to a Recall by the People. Nichols. Vol. IV. p. 59-146. Speeches of two debates and references.

Phelps. Recall, including Recall of Judges and Judicial Decisions. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. 1,273p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

The United States Constitution Should Be Amended so as to Provide That If an Act of Congress Is Declared Unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, the Act May Become Effective if Repassed by Congress by a Two-Thirds Vote. Carpenter. p. 31-9. Briefs and references.

**Reciprocity**

The United States Should Further Extend Her Policy of Commercial Reciprocity. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 164-6. Arguments and references.

The United States Should Have Commercial Reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 214-16. Arguments and references.

**Referendum**

The Adoption of the Initiative and Referendum is Practicable in This Country. Craig and Edgerton. p. 127-42. Discussions. Askew. p. 83, 149-52. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Initiative and Referendum. Wisconsin University Bulletin. 25c. Arguments and references.

The Initiative and Referendum Should Be Adopted. Carpenter. p. 185-8. Briefs and references.

The Initiative and Referendum Should Be Adopted by North Carolina. North Carolina University Record. November, 1913. 61p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

The Initiative and Referendum Should Be Made a Part of the Legislative System of Ohio. Pearson. p. 67-90. Synopses of speeches and references.

Library of Congress. Select List of References on the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. 102p. 15c. 1912.

———. List of References on the Declaration of War by Popular Vote. 3p. Typew. 40c. Ja. 26, '22. (P. A. I. S.)

———. List of Recent References on the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1924. (P. A. I. S.)

New York (state). Library. Legislative Ref. Sec. Bibliography of Books and Articles on Initiative, Referendum and Recall, 1921-1924. E. N. Snow. 13p. Typew. \$1.40. 1924. (P. A. I. S.)

New York State Should Provide for the Initiative and Referendum. Nichols. Vol. II. p. 283-315. Speeches and references.

The Optional Initiative and Referendum Should Be Adopted in State Legislation. Robbins. p. 117-27. Briefs and references

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 242-5. Arguments and references.

Phelps. Initiative and Referendum. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 3d ed. xlvii, 209p. Briefs, references and articles. o.p.

**Religious Education**

Beman. Religious Teaching in the Public Schools. (Reference Shelf. Vol. V. No. 2.) 170p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

**Roads**

Library of Congress. List of References on Earth Roads 20p. Typew. \$2.10. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of References on the Relation of Good Roads to Education. 4p. Typew. 50c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

The United States Government Should Build Good Roads. Craig and Edgerton. p. 143-59. Discussions.

**Roads. Finance**

Johnsen. Financing of State Highways. (Reference Shelf. Vol. VI. No. 1.) 209p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

A Vehicle Tax Should Be Established for the Support of Public Highways. Craig and Edgerton. p. 561-3. Outlines.

**Ruhr Valley. Occupation**

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Reading List on the French Occupation of the Ruhr. 2p. mim. 1924.

French Occupation of the Ruhr: Bates College vs. Oxford University debate. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 4.) 119p. Speeches, briefs and references.

Library of Congress. List of References on the French Occupation of the Ruhr Valley. 4p. Typew. 50c. March 1, 1923. (P. A. I. S.)

———. Brief List of References on the French Occupation of the Ruhr Valley (supplement to typew. list of March 1, 1923.) 6p. Typew. 70c. December 13, 1923. (P. A. I. S.)

Phelps. Vol. IX. p. 153-89. Speeches, briefs, references. o.p.

**Rural Credit.** See Agricultural Credit

**Rural Schools. Consolidation**

American City. (T. and C. ed.) 15:381-2. O. '16. Affirmative and negative briefs.

**Russia**

Hodgson. Recognition of Soviet Russia. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 10.) 111p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

**Russia—Continued**

Library of Congress. Brief List of References on the Soviet Government of Russia. 11p. Typew. \$1.20. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

———. List of References on the Russian Policy of the United States. 13p. Mim. March 14, 1922.

———. Russia: a List of Recent Books. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1928. (P.A.I.S.)

Stanoyevich. Slavonic Nations of Yesterday and Today. (Handbook Series.) p. xvi-xxvi, 15-201. References and selected articles.

The United States Should Recognize the Present Government of Russia. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 133-78. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Vol. VIII. p. 205-46. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

**St. Lawrence River Ship Canal**

Bringing the World to America. p. 8. References.

Johnsen. St. Lawrence River Ship Canal. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 4.) 129p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Joint Debate; H. H. Herrick and Henry J. Allen vs. Nathan L. Miller, March 1, 1922. 38p. pa. 25c. National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Washington, D. C.

Library of Congress. List of Works Relating to Deep Waterways from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. 59p. 10c. 1908.

———. Brief List of References on the St. Lawrence River Ship Canal. 5p. Typew. 60c. February 27, 1923. (P. A. I. S.)

The United States and Canada Should Develop the St. Lawrence River Deep Waterway as a Joint Project. Arnold. p. 272-5. References.

Wisconsin and the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Water Route to the Sea. Wisconsin University Bulletin. 15c. Arguments and references. o.p.

**Sales Tax**

Beman. Current Problems in Taxation. (Handbook Series.) p. 51-204. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on Excise or Internal Revenue Taxation, with Special Reference to Consumption Taxes (Including Sales Tax). 9p. Typew. \$1. Ag. 9, 1921. (P. A. I. S.)

Library of Congress. List of Recent References on Excise or Internal Revenue Taxation, with Special Reference to the Sales Tax. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Pennsylvania. Library. Legislative Reference Bureau. Bibliography of Sales Tax. I. S. Watts, comp. 9p. Typew. \$1. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Phelps. Vol. VIII. p. 107-55. Speeches, briefs and references. Out of print.

Washington. State College. Bulletin. November, 1921. References.

### **School Administration. County Unit Plan**

County Unit of School Administration. Indiana University Extension Division Bulletin. February, 1926. Articles and references.

### **Senators. Election**

Present Method of Electing United States Senators by the Direct Vote of the People Is Preferable to the Former Method. Carpenter. p. 171-4. Briefs and references.

### **Ship Subsidies**

Beman. Ship Subsidies. (Reference Shelf. Vol. I. No. 8.) 112p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Clifford. Ship Subsidy. (Abridged Debaters' Handbook Series.) 53p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o. p.

Library of Congress. A List of Books (with References to Periodicals) on Mercantile Marine Subsidies. 3d ed. with Additions. 140p. 20c. 1906.

———. Additional References Relating to Mercantile Marine Subsidies. p. 141-64. 10c. 1911.

Nichols. Vol. VI. p. 245-313. Speeches and references.

Payment by the Government of Subsidies for the Encouragement and Upbuilding of the American Merchant Marine Is Expedient. Carpenter. p. 121-8. Briefs and references.

Pearson. p. 405-32. Synopsis of debate and references.

Ringwalt. p. 121-30. Briefs and references.

Robbins. p. 179-86. Briefs and references.

Shurter. Both Sides. p. 194-6. Arguments and references.

Thomas. p. 178. Arguments.

*See also Merchant Marine*



**Short Ballot**

Bullock. Short Ballot. (Handbook Series.) xviii, 160p. References and selected articles. o.p.

The Short Ballot Should Be Adopted in all Municipal Elections. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 132-4. Arguments and references.

The Short Ballot Should Be Adopted in State, County, and Municipal Elections. Nichols. Vol. II. p. 317-64. Speeches and references.

**Silver (as money)**

Any Further Coinage of Silver in the United States is Undesirable. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 208-10. Arguments and references.

Bimetallism and not Protection is the Secret of Future Prosperity. Craig and Edgerton. p. 366-75. Outlines.

**Simplified Spelling.** *See* Spelling

**Single Tax**

Bullock and Johnsen. Single Tax. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. xxxiii, 249p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Library of Congress. References on the Single Tax (supplementing typewritten list of February 21, 1913). 4p. Typew. 50c. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

Montana. High School Debating League, 1918. 26p.

Nichols. Vol. VI. p. 155-98. Speeches and references.

The Single Tax on Land Should Be Substituted for All Other Forms of State and Local Taxation. Mabie. Vol. I. p. 499-530. Reports of debates and references. Out of print.

The Single Tax Should Be Substituted for the General Property Tax. Arnold. p. 292-4. References.

A Tax on the Rental Value of Land Exclusive of Improvements Should be Substituted for the General Property Tax. Nichols. Vol. II. p. 127-45. Brief (affirmative) and speeches (negative.)

Taxation of Ground Values. Askew. p. 140-3. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

———. Montana. High School Debating League, 1918. p. 17-21. References.

———. Ringwalt. p. 202-9. Briefs and references.

Taxation of Ground Values. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 117-19. Arguments and references.

Zinand. Modern Social Movements. p. 121-83. Bibliography. H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1921. o.p.

### **Social Insurance**

Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) lxiv, 381p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

### **Socialism**

Askew. p. 161-70. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Robbins. Socialism. (Handbook Series.) xvii, 223p. References and selected articles. o.p.

Socialism Is the Best Solution of American Labor Problems. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 176-8. Arguments and references.

Socialistic Control of the Means of Production and Exchange Would Secure a More Equitable Distribution of Wealth. Mahie. Vol. I. p. 435-98. Reports of debates and references. Out of print.

———, Nichols. Vol. VII. p. 267-336. Speeches and references.

Zinand. Modern Social Movements. p. 121-83. Bibliography. H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1921. o.p.

*See also* Guild Socialism

**Soldiers' and Sailors' Insurance.** *See* Insurance, Soldiers' and Sailors'

### **Soldiers' Bonus**

Arnold. p. 275-7. References.

Johnsen. Soldiers' Bonus. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 7.) 122p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Phelps. Vol. IV. p. 53-83. Speeches, briefs, references. o.p.

### **Sovereignty**

The Concept of National Sovereignty Should Be Discarded in the Modern World. Phelps. Vol. XIV. p. 395-433. Speeches, briefs and references.

### **Soviet**

The Soviet Form of Government is Applicable to Western Civilization. Nearing vs. Russell. Debate. 5-69p. \$1. League for Public Discussion. N.Y. 1924.

**Soviet—Continued**

Soviet System. Askew. p. 170-1. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Soviet Russia. *See* Russia

**Spelling**

It Would Be Beneficial to Adopt Simplified Rules of Spelling. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 20-1. Arguments and references.

**States Rights**

Beman. States Rights. (Handbook Series.) lxxi, 362p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 23. References.

The Policy of Centralizing Power in the Federal Government is Desirable. Nichols. Vol. IX. p. 317-79. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Volume XII. p. 195-235. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Sterilization**

Chicago, Ill. Municipal Reference Library. Brief List of References to Books and Periodicals Relating to the Sterilization of Criminal Insane and Similar Defectives. Frederick Rex, comp. 4p. Typew. 50c. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

**Strikes**

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 8-9. References.

Legal Status of Strikes. Phelps. Vol. X. Chap. 1. Speeches, briefs and references.

Prohibition of Strikes in Essential Industries. Phelps. Vol. VII. p. 141-97. Speeches, briefs and references. o. p.

Right to Strike. Special Libraries. 10: 255-67. D. '19. References.

**Suffrage**

A Reasonable Property Qualification Should Be Made the Basis of Municipal Suffrage. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 112-13. Arguments and references

We Should Maintain an Educational Qualification for Voting. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 114-17. Arguments and references.

**Sugar. Tariff**

The Grant of Sugar Bounties Would Be Contrary to Good Public Policy. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 185-7. Arguments and references.

It Is a Good Policy for the Government of the United States to Place a Tariff on Sugar. Craig and Edgerton. p. 266-85. Discussions.

Sugar Should Be Admitted Into This Country Free of Duty. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 124-5. Arguments and references.

The Tariff on Sugar Should Be Removed (Removal Gradual and Completed within Five Years). Carpenter. p. 135-7. Briefs and references.

**Superpower**

Beman. Superpower. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 9.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

**Supreme Court (United States)**

Congress Should Be Empowered by a Two-Thirds Vote to Re-enact Laws Declared Unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 181-246. Speeches and references.

Ettrude. Power of Congress to Nullify Supreme Court Decisions. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 8.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress List of References on the Popular Election of Supreme Court Judges, State and Federal. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1924. (P. A. I. S.)

The Power of the Federal Supreme Court to Declare Statutes Unconstitutional Should Be Restricted. Phelps. Vol. IX. p. 375-422 (o.p.); Vol. X. Chap. IV. Speeches, briefs, references.

**Syndicalism.** *See* Criminal Syndicalism

**Tariff.** *See* Free Trade and Protection

**Tax Exempt Securities**

Beman. Tax Exempt Securities. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 1.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

No More Tax Exempt Bonds Should Be Issued by the Federal Government, the States, or Municipalities. Arnold. p. 290-2. References.

**Soviet—Continued**

Soviet System. Askew. p. 170-1. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.

Soviet Russia. *See* Russia

**Spelling**

It Would Be Beneficial to Adopt Simplified Rules of Spelling. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 20-1. Arguments and references.

**States Rights**

Beman. States Rights. (Handbook Series.) lxxi, 362p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 23. References.

The Policy of Centralizing Power in the Federal Government is Desirable. Nichols. Vol. IX. p. 317-79. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Volume XII. p. 195-235. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Sterilization**

Chicago, Ill. Municipal Reference Library. Brief List of References to Books and Periodicals Relating to the Sterilization of Criminal Insane and Similar Defectives. Frederick Rex, comp. 4p. Typew. 50c. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

**Strikes**

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 8-9. References.

Legal Status of Strikes. Phelps. Vol. X. Chap. 1. Speeches, briefs and references.

Prohibition of Strikes in Essential Industries. Phelps. Vol. VII. p. 141-97. Speeches, briefs and references. o. p.

Right to Strike. Special Libraries. 10:255-67. D. '19. References.

**Suffrage**

A Reasonable Property Qualification Should Be Made the Basis of Municipal Suffrage. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 112-13. Arguments and references

We Should Maintain an Educational Qualification for Voting. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 114-17. Arguments and references.

**Sugar. Tariff**

The Grant of Sugar Bounties Would Be Contrary to Good Public Policy. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 185-7. Arguments and references.

It Is a Good Policy for the Government of the United States to Place a Tariff on Sugar. Craig and Edgerton. p. 266-85. Discussions.

Sugar Should Be Admitted Into This Country Free of Duty. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 124-5. Arguments and references.

The Tariff on Sugar Should Be Removed (Removal Gradual and Completed within Five Years). Carpenter. p. 135-7. Briefs and references.

**Superpower**

Beman. Superpower. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 9.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

**Supreme Court (United States)**

Congress Should Be Empowered by a Two-Thirds Vote to Re-enact Laws Declared Unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 181-246. Speeches and references.

Ettrude. Power of Congress to Nullify Supreme Court Decisions. (Reference Shelf. Vol. II. No. 8.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress List of References on the Popular Election of Supreme Court Judges, State and Federal. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1924. (P. A. I. S.)

The Power of the Federal Supreme Court to Declare Statutes Unconstitutional Should Be Restricted. Phelps. Vol. IX. p. 375-422 (o.p.); Vol. X. Chap. IV. Speeches, briefs, references.

**Syndicalism.** *See* Criminal Syndicalism

**Tariff.** *See* Free Trade and Protection

**Tax Exempt Securities**

Beman. Tax Exempt Securities. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 1.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

No More Tax Exempt Bonds Should Be Issued by the Federal Government, the States, or Municipalities. Arnold. p. 290-2. References.

**Taxation**

Beman. Current Problems in Taxation. (Handbook Series.) 350p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 41-3. References.

Library of Congress. List of References on Taxation in the United States, 1924-1926. 25p. Typew. \$2.45. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Our Present System of Taxation is the Best That Can Be Devised. Craig and Edgerton. p. 250-7. Arguments.

See also Bank Notes. Taxation; Excess Profits Tax; Income Tax; Inheritance Tax; Single Tax

**Teachers' Pensions**

Oklahoma University Bulletin. Exten. Ser. No. 30. Ja. 1, '17. Affirmative and negative arguments.

**Teachers' Unions**

Affiliation of Teachers with the American Federation of Labor. Phelps. Vol. VI. p. 111-53. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

**Terminals**

Port Terminals and Water Transportation. North Carolina. University Extension Division Bulletin. Vol IV. No. 7. December 1, 1924. Articles and references.

**Thrift**

Library of Congress. List of References on Thrift and Savings. 5p. Typew. 60c. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Towner-Sterling Bill. See United States. Department of Education (Proposed)

**Trade Unions**

Are Labor Unions Beneficial? Pearson. p. 201-20. Report of debate and references.

Bullock. Trade Unions. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. xxx, 280p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

In Anti-Trust Legislation Labor Unions Should Be Exempt from Construction as Combinations in Restraint of Trade. Michigan-Illinois Debate. Nichols. Vol. VII. p. 43-107. Speeches and references.

Johnsen. Questions of the Hour. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 10.) p. 7. References.

Labor Organizations Promote the Best Interests of the Working Man. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 1-3. Arguments and references.

Labor Unions Should Be Discouraged. Carpenter. p. 201-8. Briefs and references.

Labor Unions Should Incorporate as a Condition Precedent to Demanding Recognition by Employers. Carpenter. p. 209-12. Briefs and references.

Library of Congress. Brief List of Books on Trade Unions in the United States, with Special Reference to Recent History. 8p. Typew. 90c. January 24, 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

Zimand. Modern Social Movements. p. 5-66. Bibliography. H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1921. o.p.

*See also* Collective Bargaining

## Trusts

Federal Regulation Should Be Substituted for the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. Nichols. Vol. IV. p. 147-88. Speeches and references.

Further Federal Legislation in Respect to Trusts and Industrial Combinations Is Desirable. Ringwalt. p. 131-42. Briefs and references.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 140-1. Arguments and references.

The Government Should Accept the Principle of Monopoly Control of Industry, and Regulate the Prices in all Cases Brought about by the Operation of Economic law. Speaker. Vol. VII. p. 312-5. Synopses of speeches with references.

Library of Congress. A List of Books (with References to Periodicals) Relating to Trusts. 3d ed. with Supplementary Select List. 93p. Cloth 50c; paper 25c. 1907.

———. Lists of References on Trusts (supplementary to printed lists on federal control of commerce and corporations, 1913 and 1914). 12p. Typew. \$1.30. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

The True Solution of the Trust Problem Lies in the Direction of the Regulation of Combination Rather than the Breaking Up of Combination and the Restoring of Competition. Independent. 77:167. F. 2, '14. Briefs and references. Same. Both Sides: Briefs for Debate.

———. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 92-4. Arguments and references.



**Trusts—Continued**

Trusts and Monopolies Are a Positive Injury to the People Financially. Craig and Edgerton. p. 327-36. Outlines.

A Well-managed Trust Is Beneficial to the General Public. Craig and Edgerton. p. 504-21. Discussions.

**Unemployment**

Askew. p. 183-4. Affirmative and negative arguments. o.p.  
Federal Employment for Surplus Labor. Phelps. Vol. V. p. 83-133. Speeches, briefs and references. o.p.

The Federal Government Should Establish a Comprehensive System of Unemployment Agencies. Robbins. p. 110-16. Briefs and references.

General Booth's Employment System Should Be Adopted in the United States. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 28-9. Arguments and references.

Johnsen. Unemployment. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) 2d ed. 1,309p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Municipalities Should Furnish Aid to the Unemployed in Times of Depression. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 102-3. Arguments and references.

———. Thomas. p. 182. Arguments.

**Unemployment Insurance.** See Insurance, Unemployment

**Unemployment. Relief**

Muller. Government Fund for Unemployment. (Reference Shelf. Vol. VI. No. 5.) Briefs, references and selected articles.

**United States. Constitution**

The Constitution of the United States Should Be so Amended as to Allow Congress to Propose Amendments and a Majority of All the State Legislatures to Ratify the Same. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 236-8. Arguments and references.

**United States. Department of Education (Proposed)**

Arnold. p. 206-8. References.

Beman. Towner-Sterling Bill. (Reference Shelf. Vol. I. No. 5.) 112p. Briefs, references and selected articles. o.p.

Courtney, Stovall and Hall. A United States Department of Education: Pro and Con. Debaters Research. Vol. 3. No. 1. \$2. 1926. Arguments.

A Federal Department of Education Should Be Established with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet. Kansas University Bulletin, July 1, 1926. p. 31-5. References.

———. Montana. High School Debating League, 1925. p. 16-20. References.

———. Nichols. Vol. IX. p. 151-96. Speeches and references.

Johnsen. Federal Department of Education. (Handbook Series. Ser. II. Vol. 2.) lxviii, 357p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

———. (Reference Shelf. Vol. IV. No. 5.) 129p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Library of Congress. Short List of References on the Proposed Department of Education. 3p. Typew. 40c. 1924. (P. A. I. S.)

This House Approves the Curtis-Reed bill Providing for a Federal Department of Education. Phelps. Vol. XII. p. 95-142. Speeches, briefs and references.

United States. Elections. *See* Elections (United States)

### United States. Senate

The Present Cloture Rule of the United States Senate Is Preferable to a Cloture Rule Making It Possible for a Majority of the Senators to Close Debate and Cause a Vote on Any Measure at Any Time. Carpenter. p. 22-30. Briefs and references.

The Rules of the United States Senate Should Be Revised as Suggested by Vice-President Dawes. Phelps. Vol. XII. p. 1-49. Speeches, briefs and references.

### Vocational Education

Robison. Vocational Education. (Handbook Series.) 1,303p. References and selected articles. Out of print.

United States. Dept. of Interior. Bureau of Education. List of References on Vocational Education; prepared in Library Division. (Library leaflet 25). 20p. 5c. 1924.

### Vocational Guidance

United States. Dept. of Interior. Bureau of Education. List of References on Vocational Guidance. (Library leaflet 32.) 11p. 5c. O. 1925; (Library leaflet 33.) 22p. 5c. My. 1927.

**Vocational Guidance—Continued**

United States. Federal Board for Vocational Education. Bibliography on Vocational Guidance: selected list of references. . . ; comp. by C. L. Jacobs and Mrs. A. L. Burdick. (Bull. 66, Trade and Industrial Series 19). rev. ed. IX, 85p. 15c. 1926.

**Voting**

Library of Congress. List of References on the Educational Qualifications for Suffrage. 6p. Typew. 70c. 1925. (P.A.I.S.)

New York (state). Library. Legislative Reference Section. Data Relating to Compulsory Voting. W. E. Hannan, comp. 16p. Typew. \$1.70. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

**War**

Johnsen. War—Cause and Cure. (Handbook Series.) lxiv, 350p. References and selected articles.

Library of Congress. Economic Causes of War: a Bibliographical List. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1929. (P.A.I.S.)

The People Should Have the Right to Declare War by Direct Vote Except in Case of Rebellion or Invasion. Nichols. Vol. VIII. p. 357-87. Speeches and references.

———. Phelps. Vol. XII. p. 237-81. Speeches, briefs and references.

**Water Power. United States**

Johnsen. Federal and State Control of Water Power. (Reference Shelf. Vol. V. No. 9.) 186p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

New York (state). Library. Legislative Reference Section. Selected List of References on Water Power Material in the Legislative Reference Section of the New York State Library, 1926. C. E. Hathaway, comp. 27p. Typew. \$2.60. 1926. (P.A.I.S.)

Wisconsin. Legislative Reference Library. Recent Books and Articles on Water Power and Superpower: a Selected Bibliography Which Stresses Questions of Public Policy and Gives Particular Attention to the Wisconsin Situation. E. E. Witte, comp. 10p. Typew. \$1.10. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

**Water Rights**

Library of Congress. List of References on Water Rights and the Control of Waters. 104p. 15c. 1914.

**Waterways**

Library of Congress. List of Books on Rivers of the United States. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1927. (P.A.I.S.)

**Women. Employment**

The Emergence of Women from the Home Is a Depressing Feature of Modern Life. Phelps. Vol. XV. Chap. III. Speeches, briefs and references.

Library of Congress. Short List of References on Wages of Women in the United States. 8p. Typew. 90c. 1923. (P.A.I.S.)

**Women. Equal Rights**

Johnsen. Special Legislation for Women. (Reference Shelf. Vol. III. No. 7.) 142p. Briefs, references and selected articles.

Wisconsin. Legislative Reference Library. Women's Equal Rights: List of References to Material in the Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library; pt. 2, 1922-24. 4p. Typew. 50c. 1924. (P.A.I.S.)

The Women of the United States Should Make a United Effort to Secure at Once the Adoption of an Equal Rights Amendment to the Federal Constitution. Phelps. Vol. XIII. p. 369-413. Speeches, briefs and references.

Women Should Not Be Granted the Suffrage on Equal Terms with Men. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 38-40. Arguments and references.

**Wool. Tariff**

Wool Should Be Admitted into the United States Free of Duty. Shurter. Both Sides. p. 126-8. Arguments and references.

**Workmen's Compensation**

Bullock. Compulsory Insurance. (Debaters' Handbook Series.) xxxv, 266p. References and selected articles.

Johnsen. Social Insurance. (Handbook Series.) p. xxvi-xxxiii, 55-109. Selected articles and references.

Library of Congress. Select List of References on Employer's Liability and Workmen's Compensation. 196p. 25c. 1911.

Oklahoma University Bulletin. Exten. Ser. No. 24. 162p. Arguments and references.

**World Court.** *See* Permanent Court of International Justice













